DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 468 95 JC 770 289

AUTHOR Lieberman, Janet E.
TITLE Report on Articulated Programs Coordinating Secondary and Post Secondary Institutions.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 76
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Program); College Curriculum; *College High School Cooperation; Early Admission; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Improvement; *Post Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *Secondary Education; Student Needs; Student Participation

ABSTRACT

This report reviews secondary school/college articulated programs at 13 schools. Articulated programs are those which typically offer flexible enrollment opportunities in college level curricula for students who may be simultaneously enrolled in secondary institutions or who may leave secondary school early to pursue a higher education. Five principal types of programs are discussed: (1) early admission; (2) split day; (3) college courses taught by college faculty at high schools; (4) college courses taught by high school faculty at high schools; and (5) "separate" setting programs (separate faculty and differentiated curricula in separate facilities). Strengths and weaknesses of each type are analyzed, as are barriers to acceptance of innovative structures by students, educators, and the public. Specific steps recommended include professionally conceived and directed advertising, formation of a coordinating agency, establishment of a clearinghouse for information dissemination, special training for administrators, and development of faculty and federal economic incentives. A checklist for establishing articulated programs is included as are recommendations directed to formulation of supportive federal policies for articulated programs. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED139468

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT ON ARTICULATED PROGRAMS COORDINATING SECONDARY AND POST SECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Prepared for:

The Fund for the Improvement of
Post Secondary Education

Submitted by:

Dr. Janet E. Lieberman
LaGuardia Community College
31-10 Thomson Avenue
Long Island City, N.Y. 11101

September 1976

JC 770 289

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Review of the Literature	1
II.	Prominent Examples - Introduction	7
	Simon's Rock	9
	New York University	10a
	C. W. Post	12
	Marist College	15
	Project Advance	17
	LaGuardia Community College	19
	Hudson County Community College Consortium	21
	Staten Island Community College	23
	HISCIP, Washington, D. C.	25
	The Lab School Boston	27
III.	Strengths and Weaknesses	28
IV.	Outcomes of LaGuardia	38
V.	Alternative Structures	49
VI.	Strategies for Attracting Clienteles	53
VII.	Steps in Establishing a Middle College	57
VIII.	Evaluation Guidelines	62
IX.	Suggested Policy Changes	69
X.	Dissemination Strategies	74
	Bibliography	76

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As early as 1928 Osborn[1] reviewed the curriculum overlap between the secondary and post secondary levels. He found a 10-23% duplication of content, and thereby documented one of the primary needs for articulated settings. Following that lead, some advanced educators, Hutchins, et. al. admitted high school students to college programs in the Universities of Chicago and Wisconsin, and Goucher College. The idea lay fallow until the report of the Blackmer Committee, General Education in School and College, published in 1952. Presuming a community of faculty purpose, they identified a curriculum continuum in which they proposed a clarification of terms, the elimination of waste, the heightening of student motivation, and a general sharpening of attention to the common task.[2] The Advanced Placement Program in which more than 3,000 schools participate resulted largely from the Blackmer's Committee's recommendations.[3]

Between 1952 and 1965, psychological studies emphasized the marked similarities of the 16 to 20 year old students, and the increased capacities of students in that age range. Blos, using the term late adolescents, indicated that students in that age group are in control of "mature mental processes."[4] Based on the research of Jean Piaget, David Elkind posited that these adolescents are capable of constructing ideas and thinking about the future.[5] Erikson stressed that this stage of life can be the years for integrating a sense of self-of learning to work and to love.[6] Such capabilities, according to Bruno Bettelheim must be harnessed and acknowledged

---

[1]Osborn, W.J. Overlapping and Omission in our Courses of Study. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company 1928.

[2]Alan R. Blackmer, et. al. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1952.

[3]Hanson, Harlan P., The Four School Study Report, College Entrance Examination Board, N.Y. 1970, p. 7.

[4]Blos, Peter. On Adolescence: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation: The Free Press, 1966, p. 131-135.

[5]Elkind David. N.Y. Times Magazine, May 26, 1968, p. 73.

[6]Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society, N.Y. W.W. Norton, 1963, pp. 261-266.

by the family and the educational structures which surround the adolescent.[7] Keniston focused on the growing complexity of the society confronting adolescents, and the importance of education to help them choose among the variety of roles and possible identities.[8]

Keniston, Erikson and Bettelheim reported that although young people are physically, socially and intellectually more advanced than were their parents at the same age, the educational and social structures are not adapting to that new maturity.[9] According to Bettelheim, society is postponing the adolescent's full adulthood; we are pushing young people toward maturity while at the same time over-extending the years of their dependence on other institutions. Bettelheim called colleges unresponsive to the needs of youths and asks for better education linked to work programs. Similar concepts have been illustrated in the phrase "moratorium" originated by Erikson and enriched by contributions of Jennings, Kohlberg and Weingartner.[9a]

Jerome Kagan extended the concept to include the relationship of early adolescence to cognitive competence. He noted that today, a few years before puberty, a child is competent in dealing with hypothetical premises.[10] Research studies by Taba and others, including the Nova experiment have shown that it is possible to teach more mathematics, physics, biology and languages earlier than we now attempt.[11]

In 1967, the Carnegie Corporation sponsored The Four Schools Study, designed to examine the feasibility of making significant changes in the nature and functions of secondary schools. The monograph concluded that structural changes would improve the education of late adolescents and recommended that a single institution, a middle or an intermediate college, would be more congruent with the needs of students.[12]

---

[7] Bettelheim, Bruno, Daedelus, Fall, 1971.

[8] Keniston, Kenneth, The Uncommitted; Alienated Youth in American Society, N.Y., Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965, pp. 241-272.

[9] Bettelheim, B., Daedelus, op. cit.

[9a] Kohlberg, Lawrence, "The Adolescent as Philosopher," Daedelus, Fall, 1971.

[10] David, Robert B. "The Reformed Mathematics Curriculum," High School, 1980, Pitman Publishing Co. 1970, pp. 146-60.

[11] David, ibid.

[12] Hanson, Harlan, The Four School Study, op. cit.

The report provided the theoretical formulation and the evidence of educational dissatisfaction which generated and legitimatized subsequent educational innovations in articulation.

During this same period, Elizabeth B. Hall wrote a small, cogent pamphlet, entitled "The House of Education Needs Overhaul", which provides the rationale for the first "early college," Simon's Rock.[13]

Over the same period of years, agencies like the Committee on School and College Relations of the Educational Records Bureau studied the problem of cooperative relations between institutional levels.[14] The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in their 1973 publication, Continuity and Discontinuity analyzed the interaction between schools and colleges and specified thirty recommendations for reform in admissions process, improvement of secondary education, and preparation programs for teachers and administrators. The report concluded that the two worlds of school and college are quite different, but there are "five common interests that call for closer ties:

(1) The need to make equality of educational opportunity a reality
(2) The challenge to traditional curricula and structure at both levels.
(3) The necessity for a response to fairly widespread public disenchantment with education at both levels.
(4) The need to maximize the use of limited financial resources.
(5) The unity of educational welfare must be recognized."[15]

Many articles in the last three years have underlined the recommendations of the Carnegie Report of 1973. Coleman pointed out that the lack of educational preparation for adulthood was a consequence of the increasing number of years spent in the educational system. The labor market has no place for the adolescent, but the domination of the schools during the maturational years does not constitute a viable

---

[13]Hall, Elizabeth B., The House of Education Needs Overhaul, 1966.

[14]Singer, David A., "Secondary School Higher Education Articulation", Community and Junior College Journal, Feb. 1974, p. 20.

[15]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Continuity and Discontinuity, 1973, p. 217.

substitute for the home environment. It is an incomplete context for the necessary facets of maturation.[16]

More recently, Blanchard has re-evaluated the overlap of curricula, finding 21% in mathematics, 23% in science, 23% in English and 24% in social science. As a consequence, he estimated that nearly three million freshmen are paying fees over $420 million dollars for course content which has already been taxed at the secondary level.[17]

Review summaries by Harry Passow[18] and Bruce, Firth[19] et al list nine studies conducted on the need for reform at the secondary school level. Many of the reports criticized the age segregation of the high schools and the resulting isolated environment. Suggested reforms included extending the domain of secondary education into the two year college area and developing comprehensive education which utilizes alternative settings outside the physical plant of the school. The U.S. Office of Education Panel and the Kettering Commission study called for pilot programs "limited only by the legitimate needs of adolescents and the vivacity and imagination of educational planners."[20]

Charles Meinert,[21] Franklin Wilbur[22] and Norman Snyder[23] have surveyed some of the existing models of articulated programs. Meinert and Snyder have gathered

---

[16] Coleman, James S Yanter, Transition to Adulthood, Washington, D. C., 1974.

[17] Blanchard, B Edward, A National Survey of Curriculum Articulation between the College of Liberal Arts and the Secondary School, Chicago, 1971.

[18] Passow, Harry. Once Again: Reforming Secondary Education. Teachers College Record, Vol. 77, Number 2, Dec. 1975, pp. 161-175.

[19] Bruce, Firth, Grimsley and Halverian, Educational Forum, January and March 1976, p. 149.

[20] Passow, Harry, op. cit.

[21] Meinert, Charles, Making a Mesh of Things: School College Articulation, N Y. State Education Department.

[22] Wilbur, Franklin, School College Articulation Report #5 - Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University, 1975.

[23] Snyder, Norman, Linking Schools and Colleges, N.Y. State Ed. Dept., 1975.

data about the settings in New York State only, but Wilbur has compiled information on a broader geographical base. Snyder analyzed the factors which militate for change and offered recommendations to improve articulation. He noted that the overall efforts at school college articulation are "limited, fragmentary, and generally informal", but there are many evidences of growing interest. He classified the institutions according to the following categories.

(1) Admission to full time study for students who have completed their junior year of high school.

(2) Provisions for high school students to take individual regularly scheduled college courses while still matriculated in high school.

(3) Provision for college faculty to offer specially designed or scheduled courses for high school students, either in high school or college.

(4) Provision for high school faculty to teach regular high school or special courses for college credit in the high school.

(5) Programs in which both college and high school faculty teach college level courses in an integrated program.

Snyder reported trends in curriculum articulation, guidance, and basic skills. The final section of the report enumerated the formal structures existing in school college articulation. Although the information presented suggested that smoother transitions are developing, secondary and post secondary education are still segmented, with few formal arrangements at a regional level. Snyder attributed the lack of interest in articulation to the traditional differences in objectives, organization, finances and governance, but saw increasing incentive stemming from declining college enrollments and consequent financial needs.[24] Meinert[25] listed ten interrelated developments as forces propelling change:

1. Learner centered reform: more individualized education, flexible timing.
2. Open admissions: need for basic skill instruction, bringing high school and college closer together.
3. Urban crises.
4. Senioritis.

---

[24]Snyder, op. cit.

[25]Meinert, op. cit.

5. Earlier maturity.
6. Youth to adulthood: need for smoother transition.
7. Overlapping curricula.
8. Quest for students.
9. Teaching: improving the effectiveness of instruction.
10. Fiscal pressures.

As a result of his survey of articulation programs, Wilbur suggested that many of the new approaches can be conceptualized in a paradigm illustrated below:[26]

	COURSE DESIGN	
Teaching Responsibility	Regular Catalog	Special Design
College Faculty	A	B
High School Faculty	C	D

Wilbur's paradigm provides a useful model to examine some prominent examples of articulated settings, but the following descriptions will emphasize that each institution studied embodies a slight variation which makes it innovative.

[26]Wilbur, Franklin P., Reprinted by permission of author.

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: INTRODUCTION

As part of the survey, the writer visited thirteen schools. Each visit involved touring the site and discussion with the directors and faculty of the program. The interviews focused on strengths and weaknesses, as well as suggested policy recommendations.

The schools fall into five major categories, but no one is exactly like the other and some overlap more than one group. The five groups are (1) early admission, (2) split day (students coming to college part time), (3) college courses taught by college faculty on high school campus, (4) college courses taught by high school faculty on high school campus, and (5) separate settings.

The movement represents a general progression from the simplest adjustment using existing facilities to more complex arrangements involving greater mobility. The final stage, as institutions move away from the traditional structures, is to develop a unique setting with separate faculty and differentiated curricula.

Seen in this light, the two by two table suggested by Wilbur becomes a three by three table.

ARTICULATED SETTINGS

Location	FACULTY		
	College	High School	Other
High School	Marist Post Staten Island	Project Advance LaGuardia Middle College Lab School - Boston Marist Post Staten Island	
College	New School Marist Post NYU		LaGuardia
	Staten Island Hudson Community Hiscip		
Other			Simon's Rock

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: SEPARATE SETTINGS

SIMON'S ROCK

Simon's Rock, established in 1964, is the nation's first "Early College". A residential campus setting, located in the Berkshire foothills, with a student body of approximately 200, it accepts students at age 16, or at the completion of the tenth grade of high school and grants either an AA or BA degree. The criteria for admission are (1) academic ability and (2) sufficient maturity to take responsibility for their own educational programming.[27] Simon's Rock is unique in many ways, designed to enable the student to move at his own speed while remaining with his peer group. The program is predicated on the assumptions of a genuine peer group clustering at age 16-20 and the ability of selected 16 years olds to do college work.[28] The unusual age grouping provides both cooperation and competition of the limited peer group. At the same time, it removes the beginning college student from difficult competition with older students. Graduates of Simon's Rock are eligible to transfer to colleges or universities at different levels. Some go directly to professional school, having completed the undergraduate requirements and earned a BA degree; others continue their undergraduate education at traditional four year colleges as either sophomore or junior transfer students. A very low faculty to student ratio, approximately 1 to 7, and a strong support system of counseling enables teachers to advise the students. A transition year program in the first year has helped students assume responsibility. Baird Whitlock, former president, believes that students not only ask for but are ready for much more participation in the rules and organization that govern their lives. To accomplish this, they need the experiential opportunity with careful advising of a concerned faculty.

The faculty is specially selected for the program, from both secondary and collegiate teaching backgrounds, but Dr. Whitlock[29] emphasizes the importance of

---

[27] Whitlock, Baird, Simon's Rock, Community and Junior College Journal, Feb. 1974, Vol 44, No. 5.

[28] Carnegie Quarterly, Vol. 44, No. 1, Winter 1976, Carnegie Corporation, N.Y.

[29] Private communication with Dr. Whitlock, President, Simon's Rock.

secondary school experience. Generous foundation support and high tuition ($4,700) guarantee small classes, usually 10-15 students and enriched curriculum opportunities. The college offers seven interdisciplinary majors, with a 5-1-5 calendar. An extended campus program allows a student to take up to one fifth of his work off campus and there is an independent study program.

The program features a variety of alternative educational timetables offered in a special environment and offers the students control over his own educational planning.

Problems surface in the difficulty of student recruitment. The issue is "how can you get the students who can profit from the setting?" Currently Simon's Rock is seeking students in a competitive market. The early college concept is not familiar to parents and guidance counselors who control the flow of applicants. To demonstrate its effectiveness, "the college must reach out to a broader social group."[30] A quarter of the students receive scholarships, but there is a "rare black among them." Recruitment of suitable faculty is difficult; management of the coed dormitories is another concern. The concept of teacher-counselor works with a small faculty to student ratio, but the limited size of the faculty precludes any real specialization. Dr. Whitlock expresses the administrative difficulties by saying, "We don't fit anybody's standards."[30a] Therefore, it is particularly difficult in negotiations with official state agencies where Dr. Whitlock says he has to contend with other institutions as an equal in the state college system. The president of Simon's Rock feels that the "early college" needs a separate entity; it can't be part of an institution but can be part of a system. If the institution is outside of the usual structure, it will be a target for attack. Perhaps the most important problem is the need to keep an experimental setting innovative, to maintain its momentum.

[30]Carnegie Quarterly, Winter 1976.

30a Private communication with Dr. Whitlock.

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: EARLY ADMISSIONS

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

New York University is involved in a program of articulation know as early admissions. NYU recruits high school juniors to take their senior year as college freshmen rather than high school students. It is felt that after the junior year, students in academic programs have completed the major part of their academic programs, and for the bright, mature and highly motivated, the senior year might prove to be only a waiting period for college admission. Students admitted to the NYU program generally rank in the top half of their class. In addition to the formal application required of all NYU applicants, early admission students are interviewed by faculty who assist in determining suitability of the candidate for the program.

The New York State Department of Education awards early admission students their high school diploma upon successful completion of twenty-four college credits, usually at the end of the freshman year, at the same time their high school peers would be graduating.

In the 1974-75 academic year, there were approximately 135 students in the program. Philip Mayerson, Dean and Director of the Early Admissions program comments that there is no difference in the classroom between early admission and regular students. Since faculty are not notified as to which of their students were admitted under the early admissions program, the students are treated as regular freshman.

On the whole, the students seem pleased with the opportunity of beginning college a year early. Because of their maturity and academic competence, they generally have little difficulty fitting into the college environment. In fact, some feel that the last year of the high school experience might have been essentially a negative one. Many found themselves getting bored or even turned-off. The high schools, on the other hand, will sometimes not encourage this alternative route since they are loosing some of their best students.[31] However, the early admission applicants are self-selected, and at NYU, seem to have a sense of the benefits of this type of program. Students with majors in pre-professional programs believe that the year's time will be advantageous in the long run.

[31] Private conversation with Dean Philip Mayerson.

FRESHMAN YEAR AT THE NEW SCHOOL

Freshman Year at the New School, established in 1972, is set in an institution primarily identified with upper division undergraduate and advanced continuing adult education. The new full time day program aims at offering students who have completed their eleventh year of high school an initial college year in a collegiate environment. Although some high school seniors and their parents gravitate to the program because they can live at home, Dean Coleman, director of the program, finds an increasing number of applicants electing dormitory life. The criteria for admissions are, in order of significance: a one hour substantive student interview, faculty recommendations and college board scores. Current enrollment is about 55-60 students. The program does not grant a degree, but students have been very successful in obtaining transfers with advanced standing to prestigous four year colleges. Financed largely by tuition ($2,800), and reportedly self supporting, the program is taught by volunteer college faculty. The students in classes of 25 and under are "treated as adults". Classes ressemble junior and senior seminars in regular colleges where the capability of students is elicited by the proper environment. The faculty usually teaches only one course, frequently on a part time basis, to provide the largest possible range of different people as models for the students. The academic content includes the areas of literature, history, philosophy, social and natural sciences, mathematics and languages. Students usually take four courses a semester; classes meet four hours per week for four credits. The program grants no degree, but students transfer to other colleges in advanced standing.

Discussing the rationale and advantages of the program Dean Coleman said: "It helps to improve the capacity to make wiser educational decisions".[32] She contrasted the New School program with the average college approach where freshmen usually get shortchanged. In four year programs, freshmen are often in larger class sections with younger and less experienced professors. The New School approach emphasizes counseling, treating students as adults, providing an ambience for serious intensive work, and enabling students to have informal discussions with faculty members. As

[32]Private communication with Dr. Elizabeth Coleman, Associate Dean of the New School.

an outcome, students demonstrate a great capacity for work and gain a greater understanding of the meaning of an academic discipline.

The disadvantages are: the unfamiliarity of the program and the consequent difficulty of recruitment in a competitive market. Guidance counselors are not favorably inclined toward the program; high schools want to retain these students in local settings. Dean Coleman regrets that the small number of students probably reduces the impact of the program. She is concerned about establishing alternatives for students which relieve the constricting atmosphere of the high school and which maximize the students' learning opportunities. Dr. Coleman recommends that educators take a hard look at the entire sequence of curriculum from junior high school on and emphasizes the importance of time and money saving when there is less overlap and better articulation.

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: SPLIT DAY, BRIDGE, AND HIGH SCHOOL

C.W. POST CENTER OF LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

C.W. Post, a pioneer in articulation, is a four year private non sectarian, undergraduate institution. Founded in 1954, as a unit of Long Island University and situated in a 350 acre campus on the North Shore of Long Island, Post offers many opportunities for high school students. The student may elect full time enrollment prior to completion of high school studies or various alternatives in both credit and non-credit courses. One such option is a standard Early Admission program. Another choice, the high school enrichment program, enables a secondary school student to take one or more courses at any college session. With prior approval of the principal, the student may take courses while completing high school. Accelerating possibilities, advanced standing credit and simultaneous credit can accrue to the student.

In 1970, Post joined with Chaminade High School and two parochial schools in Queens in a first year college program for a select group of high school seniors — called FAST.* Students can take a full academic load with up to 18 credits per semester, taught by college faculty in the high school setting. The teaching by Post faculty is considered part of their regular load. The Fast students have high academic aspirations and the capacity to achieve; they earn high school graduation and a complete year of college credit. The students take a full load of regular Post freshmen courses not a mix of college and high school courses. Similar programs are now active at Mt. St. Vincent, Bronxville, Pace, Staten Island Community College and Marist.

In SCALE, Secondary Collegiate Articulated Learning Experience, Post administrators are seeking a more academically heterogeneous population. The newer program enables qualified high school seniors to take college courses and earn college credit while remaining in the high school environment, participate in extracurricular activities, retain social contacts and receive guidance services. Students enrolled held dual status as high school juniors or seniors and as college freshmen and earning dual credit; Carnegie units applicable toward high school diploma and college credits applicable to baccalaureate degree. Students undertake credit bearing courses in lieu of senior year courses. The maximum is six courses or 18 hours of college credit. Applicants must have college boards, completed the eleventh grade, earned a minimum secondary school average of 80, and present required written recommendations of the high school guidance counselor.

*FAST, Freshman Academics Studies for Talent High School Seniors.

Students are encouraged to enroll full time; the curriculum includes the usual distribution of first year college courses.

The primary responsibility for teaching is vested with quality high school faculty provided by the participating secondary school. Each designated teacher participating in SCALE is awarded adjunct faculty rank within the appropriate academic department at Post. The rank is honorary as the salaries are paid by the high school. A full time faculty member of Long Island University is responsible for development and coordination of specific college course. Each course offered is developed cooperatively by both institutions. Post charges $17 per credit and pre registers the student at the high school Class lists and tuition bills are then generated on the Post campus. The program presently exists in five high schools in five districts, and there are additional requests from twenty five secondary schools. Dr. Marvin Glockner[33] of Post predicts that the coming year will see twelve new cooperating high schools integrated into the program. Students are generally bussed to the Post Campus for special laboratory exhibits, for library facilities and for special educational events, to assist in providing students with a sense of a college experience.

At the outset of the planning, Post had difficulty implementing the program in some public school districts because of union fear that the college faculty would take away the high school jobs. As the program has developed these attitudes have diminished and Post has now expanded into the public sector. Dr. Glockner stressed that Post is eager to run a selective program with close supervision and control. For these reasons, the Post administration does not plan to extend the program beyond their original geographical limits. Such limitation also subtly reduces the union opposition.

[33] Private conversation with Dr. Glockner, director of program.

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: SPLIT DAY, BRIDGE AND HIGH SCHOOL

MARIST COLLEGE

Marist College is a small liberal arts college for men and women, on a modern 100 acre campus located on the Hudson River in Poughkeepsie, New York. The undergraduate enrollment is about 1500 full time equivalents. Historically an innovative college, Marist initiated the first of a series of programs designed to accomodate high school seniors for accelerated college study in 1973.

Marist developed its first Bridge program in the Fall of 1973 with Our Lady of Lourdes Catholic High School. Twenty-eight high school seniors undertook a freshman college program, with three courses offered at the high school campus and the remainder offered at the Marist campus. Seniors registered for a semester average of from 15 to 18 credits. Most of the private school courses are taught by Marist faculty.

In the Fall of 1975, the Bridge program was extended to two more public high schools (Franklin Delano Roosevelt High School in Hyde Park and Arlington High School in Poughkeepsie). In addition, Marist developed the School-College Course Program which is designed to recognize college level work performed by the high schools, and was in part a response to the secondary school's desire to maintain identity with their advanced programs.

In the School-College Course Program, a high school may submit a course outline and faculty vitae to the appropriate academic department at Marist for evaluation and approval. These approved avanced high school courses and teachers are then offered at the high school and may be taken for Marist credit at a tuition cost of $50. The Bridge program and the School-College Course Program may exist simultaneously in the same secondary school, in which case enrollment can reflect three types of students: Bridge students, School-College Course students, and regular high school seniors who are interested either in advanced placement and/or enrichment. Most students who participate in the Marist-high school articulation programs transfer to other colleges after their high school senior year and are able to transfer their Marist earned credits with very few difficulties.

Currently, Marist is involved in four Bridge programs and has School-College Course Programs operating in six high schools with twenty-one different Marist approved

high school courses. In this way, high school students have the opportunity to complete up to a full year of college while simultaneously fulfilling their high school graduation requirements. Academic advisement is provided by Marist faculty and general counseling continues to be performed by the high school guidance department. Marist counseling services are available if requested. This semester, 35 seniors are enrolled in the four Bridge programs. Screening for admission to these programs is performed by the high school guidance department and the director of admissions at Marist. Bridge students are eligible for financial aid as are regular Marist freshman. However, Bridge students benefit greatly from the reduced tuition rates Marist offers them ($950 for two academic semesters of up to 36 credits. The on-campus equivalent is $2600.) The Bridge student's high school continues to receive the State's daily student attendance allowance since the student is still in residence at the secondary school.

Dr. Peter O'Keefe, Director of Continuing Education and School-College Programs, states that the college is directing its attention to the mature average student, rather than exclusively to the academic elite.[34] He points out that Bridge students are highly motivated to achieve and show grades 10% higher than their comparable high school peers. Dr. O'Keefe observes that accruing college credits while still in high school seems to be a trend with "more and more seniors applying to college already having college credits."

In developing articulation programs, Dr. O'Keefe stresses the importance of sensitivity to the concerns of faculty and administration at both the high school and college level as well as to the purpose of the programs. At Marist, he obtained support from faculty through assurances that the academic integrity of the courses would be maintained. He has also found great support for these programs from the high school administrations, boards of trustees and parents, and has had little problems with teachers' unions. Students benefit greatly from the dual advisement and the orientation to the college experience. This is exhibited in the maturation of Bridge students in terms of both their personal development and academic motivation. Many students do not ultimately choose Marist for their college experience. Nevertheless, these students are more able to adapt and orient themselves to other college environments when they graduate from high school. The initial fragmentation

[34] Marist Catalog and private conversation with Peter O'Keefe, Director of Program.

of shuttling back and forth between two campuses, the change of pace and a new and unfamiliar setting poses a problem for a small group of students early in the first semester. However, by the middle of the term, most Bridge students have coped with their high school-college roles.

"It is important," says Dr. O'Keefe, "for the college to provide sufficient advisement, particularly during the first semester." He suggests that one way for the college to do this is to identify one person on campus as the liaison and supervisor responsible for the program between the campus and the school. For Dr. O'Keefe, articulation means loosening the present structures to bring continuity and fluidity throughout the entire educational system. "The present articulation programs provide an opportunity and environment for educators at all levels to enter into a serious dialogue on the entire educational process."

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: COLLEGE COURSES AT HIGH SCHOOL

PROJECT ADVANCE

Project Advance allows students in participating high schools over a large geographic area to take regular college courses in their own schools. The courses are taught by the high school teachers in the high school at a cost of $15 per credit hour. The student gets both high school and college credit; the course are identical to those taught at Syracuse University, the sponsor of the program. The courses are taught under the direct supervision of university faculty by teachers specially selected as part of their regular teaching load. They study at a summer seminar and workshop in Syracuse for which they earn three graduate credits. They then qualify as adjunct instructors, an honorary appointment. The program is carefully monitored by Syracuse with field work supervisors and recurrent one day workshops during the teaching year. The sessions provide feedback to the University faculty, and offers help to the high school teachers. High schools participating in the program can offer English, psychology, human values, biology, sociology, communications and calculus. Most courses grant three credits per semester. The student earns two separate grades, one for high school and one for college, using two separate sets of standards and criteria. Work requirements are very demanding for high school students, but the credits gained can be transferred to a variety of colleges and universities. In 1974 75, there were forty high school and 2,000 students participating in the program.[35]

In New Jersey, Rumson-Fair Haven High School adopted the project to serve a variety of needs. The community was exploring alternatives because of the student's low level of writing skills and lowered college board scores. There was considerable interest in a consolidated three year high school program with the senior year as an alternative, which might eventually mean declining enrollment for the high school. Community colleges were offering advanced placement. Following a presentation to parents and students, 60 voluntary students, predominantly the higher achievers, enrolled. Dr. Newton Beron, project director, has found the high quality of teachers attracted to the program became a significant strength. Faculty are young, motivated

[35] Chapman, David and Wilbur, Franklin; Project Advance, N. Y. State Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. II, Number 1, 1976, p. 28.

open and willing to learn from their association with Syracuse University faculty. The training has a ripple effect in the high school; the teaching of other faculty is upgraded through exposure and curriculum innovation. According to teaching faculty at Rumson, the program requires dedicated, motivated teachers and the level of committment and work is much greater than the ordinary work level. Also the student must be highly motivated. According to the English teachers, Project Advance is more desirable than the Advanced Placement program because the achievement does not rest on a single examination. "The program offers the student an opportunity to experience college standards and materials. Students with weaker academic backgrounds can enroll to get a better idea of their ability to handle college courses in a low cost, low threat situation."[36] They earn high school credit even if they don't earn college credit. The experience of Project Advance emphasizes the relationship of two factors to student success: student motivation and reading ability. Students enrolled tend to be in the top 12% of college bound students in general with SAT V and M averages in the mid 500's.[37]

The high school faculty praised the clear objectives and the self pacing in the curriculum approach, but regretted the lack of techniques offered for teaching comprehension skills in the literature.

Project Advance is the largest program in the country that enables students to earn college credit for high school courses. The major advantage is the transportability and replication available in different geographical areas.

[36] Private interview with Dr. Beron and faculty at Rumson.

[37] Chapman and Wilbur, op. cit., pg. 36.

LAGUARDIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

LaGuardia Community College, located in a working class community in Queens, N.Y., is the only urban, non-residential setting which aims at providing a free, middle college program for an open admissions population. Based on the idea that young people aged 16-20 form their own peer group, LaGuardia's plan is a five year sequence for high risk students. In combining the last three years of high school and the first two years of college, the innovators aimed at offering early and special attention to high school students. A major objective of the plan are (1) to reduce the need for remediation at the college level, (2) to reduce the high school drop out rate, and (3) to attract more students to higher education. Adjusting the time frame to meet the students' needs, the structure provides a closer correspondence between the adolescents' psychological needs and his educational setting. The design of the program was to place the students in the midst of the community college milieu, thereby offering the adolescents a successful older peer group and stimulating motivation for higher education. The participants have the opportunity to take high school and college level courses. Regular high school faculty teach the high school courses as the school is designated a legitimate alternative school under the aegis of the New York City Board of Education. The advanced courses are part of the college curriculum; middle college students are mainstreamed and they receive dual credit. As an alternative school, the progam is funded by the New York City Board of Education in the same way as other high schools, but classes are smaller and the faculty student ratio is 1 to 20. Each year 125 students are admitted to the program and this year there are 350 students distributed across three academic years.

Originally funded by Carnegie and the F.I.P.S.E., the program required two planning years (1972-74) before accepting its first students. Criteria for entrance include parental permission, residence in a neighboring geographical area and completion of the ninth grade at selected junior or senior high schools. At least twenty per cent of the incoming students read two years below grade level, thus mirroring the urban population. Success of the middle college was predicated heavily on the support offered by the teacher-counselor role. The curriculum fulfills the New York State requirements for a high school diploma and students have the option (1) to graduate at the conclusion

of the twelfth grade (2) to continue at LaGuardia or (3) to transfer their credits to another institution.

The current program differs from the original planning document in several key areas. Problems have surfaced in integrating middle college students into college courses and in launching the cooperative education component of the program.

In other areas: recruitment, screening, diagnosis and evaluation of students, new procedures have evolved which are replicable in other settings. Although the teacher counselor role requires dedicated faculty, it seems to have significant value for student motivation. As part of an unsettled urban educational scene, middle college has suffered from changes in personnel, turnover of directors and loss of teachers. In spite of the urban crises, the institution has maintained its population and identity. A subsequent section will highlight the outcomes of the LaGuardia Program.

HUDSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMISSION

Hudson County Community College Commission, established in 1972, embodies a totally different concept of articulation and of an educational institution. Dr. Joseph P. O'Neill, architect and president of the Commission, recognized the difficulty inherent in marketing a new idea and as a consequence used new terms and titles to signal to the reader a unique presence. Hudson County Community College Commission is primarily a brokerage, reaching out and enlarging the opportunity and access to higher education. Dr. O'Neill expresses as part of his mission "to create a community college track", to develop awareness among students and guidance personnel that currently there are higher education facilities available to a different student body. The outreach program was designed to attract those students and to ease their entrance into higher education. The commission processed students who then took credits in cooperating institutions, Stevens Institute of Technology, Jersey City State College, and St. Peters College. To facilitate the transfer, Hudson offered in-depth counseling services, which emphasized financial aid opportunities and a basic skills program. The absence of any campus or any full time academic faculty at Hudson demonstrates the flexibility and versatility of a low cost, highly efficient, management model for educational projects.

To accomplish the mission, Dr. O'Neill requested and received new legislative approval. Although he could have used the existing law, he elected to go a more difficult route to differentiate his structure and to underline the need for new guidelines. The campaign became an educative experience for freeholders and community personnel, emphasizing that evaluation would have to include new criteria. "The old guidelines simply do not work; we are using the wrong baseline; the traditional concepts no longer apply."[38]

The unfamiliarity of the concept created problems at the beginning of the Commission's history. Initially, the plan was to establish a middle college, using a vocational and an academic setting. A combination of factors thwarted the initial attempt, namely resistance of two college faculty senates and opposition by a local branch of the influential teachers' union. The union saw the innovation as threatening jobs in a climate of decreasing enrollment.

[38] Private conversation with Dr. O'Neill.

Ambivalence about the degree granting power led Hudson to become an educational hybrid. Dr. O'Neill also enumerated the real structural difficulties in establishing a new concept. A brokerage assumes or presupposes a well identified network of services. Such collective information does not exist in the educational community. Hudson has assumed a new role; it is acting like a foundation, using its resources to create new capabilities in neighboring educational institutions. The Commission is helping others to realize new potentials through better use of their own resources. It is doing more than shifting funding; it is enabling institutions to move.

Having had success with placing high school students into college programs, Hudson is now moving into implementing its original plan for a middle college. The anticipated design is to establish a separate school within a school at a vocational technical high school which will offer college courses and credits for high school students. The areas of articulation and the curriculum design has been worked out by joint design at the staff and faculty level. Admission to the program will be voluntary and supervision will be under the aegsis of both the high school and college authorities.

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: SPLIT DAY, HIGH SCHOOL COURSES

STATEN ISLAND

The Staten Island Cooperative Continuum of Education is another umbrella project, utilizing varied approaches: a bridge program, curriculum articulation, skills and resource centers, learning exchanges and faculty exchanges, and training programs. Overall the program involves more than one hundred schools and four colleges, and an average of 6,000 people on a given day. The aim is vertical articulation, "breaking down the barriers between levels,"[39] and the plan approaches a regional consortium. Following a careful community study, Edward Brennan, Director, shaped the structure in 1973 to solve the local educational problems of transition.[40] The program has two special objectives: (1) feasibility of inter-age grouping, reflecting the flow of education and (2) use of students as agents of dissemination. Mr. Brennan hopes to show that the educational system can develop flexibility to adapt to the needs of the individual.

Funded by Ford, Carnegie, Hazen, New York City Boards of Education and Higher Education, and the members of the continuum, the program has multiple units to accomplish its diversified goals. In the bridge aspect, public and private junior and senior high schools send their students to take up to eight credits on campus. They continue attending the secondary school while their college credits are "banked" in the City University computer for later application to the college of their choice. The students are self selected, but must be approved by the sending school. Students are assisted by two full-time counselors on grant funding.

Mr. Brennan initiated the program with a three day conference with the United Federation of Teachers (U. F. T.) which resulted in a mutuality of purpose and substituted cooperation for resistance. A measure of this support derives from the demonstrated results of the program and from the contributions the program has made to the schools. Statistical evidence also attests to the Continuum's success: For example, in Fall, 1975 the bridge program had:

> 309 students enrolled, only 17 did not finish and the remaining 292 had amassed 1300 credit hours. 97% passed, 63% received either A or B grades, and 267 student re-enrolled.

[39] CUNY Courier, March 25, 1976, Vol. 3, No. 12, p. 4.

[40] Ibid.

In Spring 1976, there were 500 students in the program of which 50% were from parochial schools, whose enrollments represent only about one quarter of the high school age student population.

Skills centers were established by the Continuum, staffed by tutors and teachers from the high schools and colleges. The goal of these centers is to provide basic remediation for English and mathematics. In addition, the Continuum staffs a Classroom Assistants Program through which high school and college students are placed as interns in lower grades. "College for Kids," a more recent innovation, provides the opportunity for exceptional Staten Island College students to teach bright elementary and high school students and earn credits for the experience.

A specific curriculum articulation effort, in which primary and secondary school teachers work together, represents another major activity within the Continuum. In this team approach, the teachers aim at creating an integrated flow of the academic materials provided by the various school levels and design interdisciplinary curricula in major subject areas. The faculty have developed resource handbooks and curricular programs in teacher training. Teachers have continued to form alliances and work together to enrich their own programs and curriculum programs. In turn, some of these activities feed back into the diagnostic and resource centers. The college is currently developing evaluation instruments for determining levels of mastery in mathematics and reading.

Mr. Brennan finds that the bridge population is marked by a dichotomy, the students appear to be split 50-50 between the bright and highly motivated and the underachievers, yet both groups perform equally well. "Apparently these underachieving, underrated and sometimes failing students are really turned on by the new and different milieu of the college experience."[41] One reason may be that the student who has never been identified in class becomes recognized and now achieves support at the home school. Additionally, students are given the opportunity to select their own interest areas, and to think and react to bodies of knowledge that are "real to them."[42]

[41] Private communication with Mr. E. Brennan, project director, Associate Dean of Staten Island Community College.

[42] Ibid.

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

HISCIP, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Hiscip, at Washington, D.C., an acronym for a high school college internship program, is offered in cooperation with the Division of Continuing Education of Washington Technical Institute and the Public Schools of the District of Columbia. The brochure describing the program reflects the description used by the prototype, the C.W. Post Center. "The programs allows highly motivated seniors to take college courses on campus and earn college and high school credits. Students enrolled in the program hold dual status... credits earned are applicable to a college degree. The rest of the parameters of the program are the same as Post and Marist, gaining high school diplomas, using the college facilities, transferring college credit, high school teachers as adjuncts in colleges."[43] Criteria for admission are also the same; completion of the eleventh grade, evidence of motivation. Addressed to an urban population, the program requires only a 2.0 grade point average, which means the needs of the students are quite different. The inner city's student creates problems for articulation with conventional college administrations.

Part of that difficulty is reflected in the history of the Hiscip project. Funded in 1974, the administrators in the Washington, D.C. school system could not find a place to set the program. The difficulty was compounded by the internal unrest in the school system and the subsequent resignation of Barbara Sizemore. Evelyn Marshall, present director of the program, was assigned the responsibility for implementation. The first year she spent considerable time in research, finally finding a program in Howard University. She initially placed some students in that program, but because there was no letter of agreement and because of the problems inherent in the urban educational scene, the program "did not succeed. The kids were dropped." Molded by that experience, Mrs. Marshall chose another setting for a primary articulation resource; Washington Technical Institute. Sixty "strong academic" students are currently in their second quarter of the program. At Howard 20 students are on the college campus only one day a week, and the program is primarily an orientation to college program and a motivational device for higher education.

Mrs. Marshall, herself a guidance counsellor, feels that students and programs of this type need great support which is only to be found largely in the counseling staff

[43] C.W. Post Catalogue.

in their home school. Students did not have the resourcefulness to seek the help as it is structured at the college level. Therefore she personally arranges for group guidance sessions, held at the high school, on a "rap" session basis, informal and according to need. Small problems, common to high schools, complicate articulation for lower socio economic students; i. e. Who is going to provide tokens, pay for books ?

In discussing the problems, the director emphasized that the traditional educational milieu is not alternatively minded. The high schools administrators are concerned about "creaming off the better kids." She thinks the program should be at the central office, and there is a greater need for policy which includes all the diversity of local schools. She finds the high schools concerned about credentials; it is the institution responsible for high school diploma accreditation. The receiving institutions are insistent of the prerogative of choice; their only understanding is the early admissions program. Although it was not expressed, the problem is in extending the program to "average" students. Mrs. Marshall believes that the staff needs orientation for programs to succeed and there is a need for agreement at the highest administrative level.[44] In spite of the problems, the concept has already spread in Washington, D. C.. Georgetown has a science program with college faculty in the high school, and Federal City College is planning similar innovations through teacher training.

[44] Private conversation with Mrs. Marshall.

PROMINENT EXAMPLES: HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS

THE LAB SCHOOL - BOSTON

The Lab School in Boston, Mass. has articulation only as a peripheral factor; the main focus in on integration. Founded on the principal of a magnet school in direct response to the need to integrate the Boston secondary schools, the Lab School emphasizes that suburban students can be drawn to the inner city if the program is exciting enough. Articulation eventuates in that context and in the community educational effort to improve the explosive situation. The program accomodates 150-200 students who come for courses into an old, dilapidated, inner city school, but who have to receive their credit from their home, sending school. Alan Weisberg, a young, dedicated director conceived the program as an outgrowth of his work in EDCO Metropolitan Education Center. The aim was to provide services not available in the home schools. This consists largely of a humanistic environment, some student control over decision making and innovative curriculum. The academic content includes Programs in Environmental Studies, Government Studies, Community Studies, Theatre Arts, and Communication, which includes some skill development.

There are obvious problems in this structure; there is no back up for the individual school and it is not integrated into the system. Nevertheless, on an individual student basis and with a personalized approach, Mr. Weisberg has been able to achieve articulation agreements in Bunker Hill Community College and in Suffolk University and at the Harbor Campus of the University of Massachusetts. In these arrangements, the students are receiving high school credit for college level courses.

The Lab School was included in this survey because it suggests another educational aspect of alternative, articulated settings; the potential for integration by utilizing a different structure, for harnessing motivation. Mr. Weisberg had excellent results in improving basic skill levels. He describes the needs of his students as follows: "They have had it with the high schools; they want something harder; they thrived on the independence and the close staff support."[45] He sees the lack of money for planning after the first year as a significant drawback to the continued success of innovative programs.

[45] Private conversation with Mr. Weisberg.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Split Day

Strengths

The simplest articulation model is the offshoot of the early admissions program: the split day, where high school seniors can take courses on the college campus. Historically, it is the oldest program and numerically the most popular. Easiest to initiate, these programs are largely under the control of the college and require only the minimal participation from the high school administration for successful implementation. Neither institution has to alter its basic structure; the program is usually a small addition to a larger institution. Designed to service only a small group of students, the budget and personnel allocation is minimal; therefore the chances of continuation are enhanced.

Since students are all voluntary and usually high achievers, the participants are frequently satisfied. Students receive dual credit; the institutions have duplicate funding. Parents and the community welcome the opportunity for enriched education. College faculty who teach these courses integrate the high school students into their regular classes. The jurisdictional lines are clear and high school faculty are not heavily threatened by these programs. Each institution takes credit for innovation procedures; the college also has the potential of attracting students for later enrollment.

Weaknesses

A principal weakness of the split program is the student's loss of identity. At a time when adolescents need to develop their sense of self, their institutional affiliation is fragmented and their sense of belonging is confused. Additionally, they are at the top of the high school ladder and at the bottom of the college hierarchy, which complicates the schizoid quality of duplicate school environments.

Related to this but less obvious is the problem of merging two cultures. Imbedded folkways of the secondary school and the college settings differ significantly from each other. High school is compulsory; college attendance is voluntary. Both students and faculty share this knowledge and behave accordingly. In high schools,

"they are stuck with each other" and faculty make every effort to encourage attendance, motivation and mastery. Traditionally, college faculty have a preconceived opinion of the content to be learned and the student either makes it or he doesn't. If he doesn't succeed, the student bears the responsibility for failure; also he can always withdraw. Cultural differences between the two levels are numerous, and have great impact on the student as he balances two cultural environments with differing values.

The burden of this program is on the student; frequently transportation and scheduling make it difficult to secure desired courses. In many cases, courses are limited by the faculty available and the regular freshman usually have preferential registration. Frequently students have to pay college fees, which eliminates some participants. Recruitment depends on the cooperation of the high school, where guidance counselors sometimes selectively screen candidates. The high school administrators may subtly undermine the program as they do not like to lose their most able students. Students have to negotiate two systems, registration, transcripts, bookstores, frequently without help.

Another weakness of this arrangement is the lack of integration in counseling. In many of these settings, the counseling function is split, with college advisors available but not necessarily assigned to the student. Threading their way through the maze of college administrative offices to find a college counselor is often more than an adolescent can accomplish. Throughout the survey, program developers have insisted that a low student to counselor ratio is essential to the success of programs. The split day does not foster that condition. The two campus model also creates problems in transportation and in scheduling. It is hard to integrate and maximize two programs both for the student and for the institution.

COLLEGE COURSES TAUGHT ON HIGH SCHOOL CAMPUS

Strengths

In another model college courses are taught in the high school by college faculty. The strength of this high school campus model is in preserving the integrity and identity of the student while offering him the advanced learning. It also allows the student to try out college courses, (higher education) to see if he can succeed. This may attract some additional students to college. The presence of college courses

may encourage students to remain in high school for the senior year. High school administrators fight hard to keep the students as they offer stability and leadership to the institution.

Another significant strength is the "ripple" effect on the high school faculty; the level of faculty functioning may be raised by the interchange with college faculty. As an enrichment to an established institution the program is more secure than one requiring special funding or legislative approval. The student body is there. It does not have to be recruited, merely attracted. High school administrators see these programs as prestigious for their personal and institutional reputations; the community likes them; they have a positive image.

Weakness

A major weakness of the program is the limitation set by the high school environment. This is true for the number and kind of students referred as well as the opportunity for the individual's growth. He is still captive of the institution, at a time when he may be ready for new freedoms; the "greening of the high school" has not eventuated.

Another major difficulty can be the resistance of the faculty. Program directors at Marist, Post and Hudson were defeated in their first attempts because the high schools perceived a threat to their security. In large urban systems, the strength of teachers' unions has been a significant if covert factor in discouraging articulated settings. In cities like New York, unions have a strong lobby at the state level. Higher education officials do not and can not, because of the funding formulas, alienate the union officials at one level because there will be labor repercussions at the higher level. Compromise is usually the resolution with valuable segments of the programs being sacrificed.

Additionally the prevailing attitudes of the high school culture usually encourage only the academically proficient student to participate. At one and the same time, this presages success, but discriminates against the marginal or risk student. Similarly, the departmentalization of the high school discourages the promotion of interdisciplinary courses, which may be the most interesting and most valuable as capstone courses.

The dual cost to the public of the current mode of financing these courses has already been mentioned, but there is another disadvantage to this model. Where students are required to pay for college courses, the admission is limited to the financially able student. In some cases, the discrimination is overcome by the school's assuming the cost burden, but this can only be done in affluent systems and can not be done in great numbers. Two other areas are very hazy in this system, faculty salaries and credits. In most cases students acquire dual credits, both high school and college. This relates directly to financing, but also creates a somewhat false standard for individual adolescents. In essence we are encouraging them to beat the system, which is predicated on credits. The practise also reflects the general confusion about the requirements for a high school diploma, or what content should be taught at what level.

In most of these settings, faculty are paid by the college; they are considered college staff and are scheduled by college administrators. When high school faculty work 25 periods a week with classes of 30 or more and college faculty work in the same setting on a 15 hour week with small classes, the comparison may be a source of friction. The choice of faculty is limited to those who volunteer. This may be desirable but may not attract the most able teachers. At present teaching in an alternative setting is not built into the reward system for college faculty and time spent otherwise may result in greater promotion opportunities.

High School Faculty Teach College Courses

Strengths

In another variation, high school faculty teach college credit courses on secondary school grounds. Project Advance, Advance Placement courses, some parts of the Marist program and others use that arrangement. In general, the strengths of maintained identity, dual credentials, ease of administration, lack of threat, faculty ripple effect all pertain to this model as well. It's popularity and spread attest to its ease of adoption.

Weakness

One weakness in this model is the narrowness of the high school culture. In many of these settings that same cultural attitude limits the student enrollment to academically advanced students. Although adding college courses is easy for the high school, the problems of students entering college with one year's college credits curtails the college

offering and reduce it to virtually a three year degree program. Since the number of students in articulation programs remains small, the impact on the college is not yet apparent. As programs expand, the outcome will escalate the declining enrollment problem of the four year institutions.

Separate Settings

Strengths

Finally, separate institutions like Simon's Rock and Hudson have the strengths of independence, freedom of design, and autonomy. They have freedom in their hiring policies, with the possibility of hiring secondary or college level faculty or both. All aspects of the program are voluntary; the institution can determine its admission policies, governance and curriculum. The opportunity for growth is open ended; students have great freedom and academic mobility. Pacing is flexible and individualized. Neighboring institutions can be enlisted to share their facilities and the students' programs can be assembled from independent study, projects or outside courses. Counseling is usually very important, well organized and strong in these settings. The faculty to student ratio is often low and individualized attention is the theme of the context. Students are happy; they progress rapidly and achieve consistently.

Weakness

Sometimes the combination of these factors makes the education expensive and there is not enough funding for minority or poor students. Isolated from the main stream, the institutions suffer from lack of understanding and have difficulty explaining their advantages to prospective students and to the educational establishment at large. Frequently, that lack of understanding creates difficulties in obtaining legislative permission for degree granting authority. More often the laws are written for the traditional 8-4-4- plan, and variation requires a lengthy legislative campaign. Here the separate setting lacks the force of a large established institution with a vocal constituency. It is a hybrid; legislators themselves need education in a new idiom to understand articulation. In these setting, the student also may suffer somewhat from being isolated from the mainstream. He too must explain the concept of his schooling. Furthermore, these institutions may find themselves competing with the larger institutions. The student is now a commodity in a marketplace where economic considerations are often primary.

Funding is difficult; start up costs are high and much underwriting time and money is required for planning. The institution, small and separate, is vulnerable. It must compete on an equal basis with total systems. If it is successful and larger institutions resent the success, the new setting has few defenders; it is not organized into an infrastructure.

Independent settings are more expensive because they can not draw on general administrative overhead of universities or school systems. Additionally recruitment is difficult because of the unfamiliarity of the concept and the lack of resources of the individual institution. Course offerings may be limited by the size of the faculty, but frequently this problem is offset by the dedication of faculty and the resources available to the student.

Although independent settings are perhaps the most difficult to initiate, they offer student the greatest potential for individual growth. They also offer the system the greatest alternatives in innovative settings.

Common Strengths

The movement for reform at the secondary post secondary level represents a dynamic response to the rigidities of the system. Articulated settings are a way of coping with the lack of fit between the student and the institution. Structural and temporal adjustments take varied forms; some merely alter the site and the faculty, others break down the assumptions and break out of the restrictive patterns. The latter group offer the opportunity for creative change in the system, but all represent a living research and design project, aimed at improving the current system.

Common to all is the emphasis on student need and the attempt to make the education more appropriate. A sub unit of that concern is an attempt at providing self paced learning, opening options and encouraging advanced study. The efforts aim at reducing the current curriculum overlap and at meeting the emotional and psychological needs of the adolescent.

Recognizing the adolescent problems, the best of the settings provide strong guidance programs and a close teacher-student relationship. Whatever the ratio, a common strength is the increase of opportunities available to the student and his awareness of the options.

A further advantage is that the student has some control over his own educational plans. As a consequence, the adolescent becomes more involved and more motivated towards higher education.

Another shared goal is an attempt to develop continuity in the curriculum and to match the learning challenge with the individual's capacity. In many cases, the student has a much broader choice of subjects and a real incentive for learning.

Reducing a year of tax levy funded attendance at either high school or college level saves the general public $1,500 to $2,500 per student which hopefully surfaces in lower taxes. In a private or parochial setting, the individual parent pays one year's tutition instead of two, a saving of approximately $4,000 per student. Currently this is an unrecognized strength of articulation because in most public settings, secondary school financing is a separated bureaucratically from higher education support, either at the community or state level.

The separation encourages dual credits and double funding which presently is a stimulant for articulation. Currently the system works so that high schools collect the average daily allowance from the state for the high school student. The same individual registered in the college contributes to the Full Time Equivalent count, which is also funded. In addition, that student can qualify for federal grants which help to pay tuition costs. Later on, that incentive will disappear and the economic reality will surface. Major public and private economies could be effected by increasing the number of articulated settings; the savings would be both in dollars and in time.

And finally, if effectively utilized, the institutional sharing of the combined senior high school, freshman college year can result in large economies both public and private. Public funding can be substantially reduced by eliminating at least a year from the combined curriculum. (Some educators estimate that two years can be omitted).

Common Problems

In spite of the differences of individual institutions, most articulated settings deal with common problems. Of these the first is the unfamiliarity of the concept, the reluctance to have a new idea accepted, the fundamental resistance to innovation. The accrediting institutions and other authorities have no vocabulary, no category to classify middle college or freshman year. Legislators need education and experience. The rigidities in the educational bureaucracy, according to some administrators, create apathy and misunderstanding.

The lack of identity is a natural consequence of the newness of the structure. It is an unavoidable given of any innovation. Until the institution crystallizes enough to develop a specific identity, there are problems in establishing general criteria for admissions and in evaluation.

For most of these institutions no models or precedents exist; there is no way to compare your institution to any other. In general, the problems seen by authorities are usually not those seen at the grass roots. For example, credits and transfers are not problems for the functioning institutions but those are the areas most frequently cited by state boards of education and federal commissions.

Currently there is much confusion about the requirements for a high school diploma. While this ambiguity is a blessing in disguise for the administrators, it is not desirable on either a statewide or national level. Variations confuse students and in some cases make articulated settings impossible.

Another shared concern is establishing criteria for the selection of students. "How do you insure that you get the kids who can profit by the program?" was one expression. The lack of familiarity with the concept and the basic conservatism of both parents and school personnel keeps high school guidance counselors from referring students who could profit from articulation. There is a need to reach the student directly rather than through the guidance office.

Particularly in the public high school sector, screening procedures create another problem. Should achievement be the most important measure? What is the relative significance of that score vs. motivation or maturity? Can you compare a students' progress in a traditional setting to one in which the value systems, ambience and self image are totally different?

Most of the institutions studied report concern about recruiting and selecting faculty, who can see the challenge, and who can survive outside the regular system. Again, what qualities are important for faculty in innovative settings? Where the programs work well, faculty work extremely hard, and experience enormous fatigue.

The teacher-counselor role is a difficult one, but it is that relationship which program directors characterize as the principal difference between articulated institutions and secondary schools. Faculty periodically need "retooling," a chance to see other settings, to pick up new ideas, but limited funding and small staffs reduce the possibility of sabbaticals or faculty exchanges.

The problem of training faculty to work in innovative institutions is closely related to recruitment. Those who come from college may be ignorant of what it takes to teach younger students. One researcher reports that the greater the level of the faculty's ignorance, the greater the perception of differences.

Another problem, seen by the author, but not stated by the innovators, is the responsibility for the supervision of faculty. In the split setting, with different union requirements, who is contractually responsible? Does the faculty member have to satisfy both administrations? What if there is a difference in evaluations? Procedures at the high school level are most perfunctory; at the college level, peer and student evaluations are frequently quite searching.

Still, another problem is the coordination of counseling, particularly for the split day students. Integration of scheduling transportation, accounting procedures are administrative headaches.

Fundamental to all is the problem of keeping the institution innovative. As an institution continues, the cultural pull is back toward the traditional folkways. Or, the school takes a defensive attitude towards its own innovations and institutional paralysis sets in.

There are additional common problems which can be subsumed under the heading of the lethargy of the system. As more students come into the college setting with advanced credit, institutions will be forced to change. There is a need to treat the educational continuum as a whole, to examine the total number of students and the levels of support. The relationship of secondary to post secondary education must be one of mutual dependence not protection of territory. The problem is largely that education is organized around institutions and credits not around learners. As Dean Colman said, "The educational delivery system does not make itself compatible to the pace of learning nor the time available." We need to assess learning and to decide what is most appropriate to teach at what level.

SUMMARY OF ARTICULATED SETTINGS

	Strengths	Weaknesses
Early Admissions	Easy administration Economical Established program No extra overhead	No special counseling No special curriculum Serves only advanced students Students sink or swim
Split Day	Easy to initiate Limited high school resistance Dual counseling Dual credits Saves money	Split identity Dual counseling For high achievers usually Student in two cultures Transportation, scheduling difficult
College Instruction on High School Campus	Preserves student identity Student has opportunity to try out college level courses Faculty upgrading Dual credits Voluntary faculty No recruitment problem	Limited by high school environment and culture Restricted to departmental structure Only volunteer faculty Small population
High School Faculty Teach College Courses	Maintain student identity Dual credits Easy administration No faculty resistance Faculty upgrading High school counseling	Narrow high school culture Usually for advanced students only Restricted to departmental structure Limited to high school faculty Numbers small
Separate Settings	Special curriculum Flexible pacing Individual counseling Unlimited numbers possible Autonomy Academic mobility	Expensive No infrastructure Need for interpretation May need educational legislation Competing for students

OUTCOMES OF LaGUARDIA MIDDLE COLLEGE

Middle College is a case study of the accomodating necessary to launch innovative and unfamiliar programs. A summary of the original plan and the alterations required provides an example of developmental changes.

The original design, developed after two years of planning, was a five year program including three years of high school and two years of college. It was modeled after Simon's Rock but applied in a public urban setting. The target population was 125 voluntary, open admissions students admitted after the ninth grade, each year, for a period of five years. The student to faculty ratio was 15 to 1; the curriculum was an interdisciplinary one, centered on career education. Students came to school on the college campus and were admitted to college courses as soon as they appeared ready; dual credits were earned, and they could move through the program as rapidly as they were able. There would be an interchange of college and middle college faculty. The funding was routed through the Board of Higher Education on an average daily allowance basis for high school students and later on an FTE basis. The program involved a work-study component similar to LaGuardia's cooperative education internship program. Every teacher was expected to fulfill a teacher counselor role and to provide remedial reading in the content areas. Students were to be assigned to "houses," which were the fundamental governance unit of the middle college and enabled the house teacher to be the faculty member responsible for his student-house members. Students were evaluated using the LaGuardia grading system, with grades communicated in student-faculty conferences. College students were involved as tutors and middle college shared the physical facilities of LaGuardia.

The primary objectives were improved basic skills, competency, improved attendance, better retention, and more opportunity for higher education. In addition, the program aimed at broadening career goals and providing an educational setting consistent with the student's psychological needs. The last objective included development of a teacher counselor role as a model for teachers.

The major alteration in planning resulted from a switch in funding procedures. Originally the plan provided for state and city funding channeled through the Board of Higher Education. Because of an inability to negotiate the flow of money at the state level, the Middle College came under the aegis of the Board of Education and was designated as an alternative school. Many changes in implementation resulted. Instead of recruiting an average urban population where two-thirds of the students require remediation, the LaGuardia setting was forced to accept a population in which three fourths of the students functioned below grade level. The Middle College was required to accept more than 15% of its students reading below the sixth grade or four years retarded. This compromise was necessary to gain the cooperation of the sending schools in the Queens district. Recruitment was routed through the guidance counselors, thereby making the program dependent on their perception of the desirable student and their pre-screening activity. The incoming student body needed more remediation than had originally been planned. In addition, the Board of Education control of funds and the consequent affiliation at the state level brought with it a multitude of regulations concerning faculty selection, working conditions, administrative procedures, scheduling and evaluation routines. More subtly, the infrastructure influenced loyalties, responsibilities, identification, authority, curriculum and the educational values of the setting. "The power of the site", as the concept is used in evaluation literature, suggests that the dominant culture which emerged was that of a secondary school rather than a college.

Forced to operate under the teachers' union regulations, Middle College could only recruit faculty already licensed by the Board of Education. The principal chosen came from the traditional high school setting and his implementation reflected his own experiential background. The choice of personnel in leadership positions was severely restricted and the program reflected that limitation. Teachers hired were unfamiliar with the teacher counselor role, accustomed to a 25 hour schedule and a departmental assignment. They had difficulty accepting the expanded conception of teacher counselor and were unable to carry out the remedial teaching in the content areas.

As a consequence of these changes the first year saw the abandonment of the interdisciplinary plan and the postponment of the career education component. A more familiar, subject oriented program replaced the original design. Responsible to a Board of Education District Superintendent, the director of Middle College had the autonomy of a regular high school principal. At the same time changes in the Dean of Faculty's office at the high school level resulted in less college involvement and the program lost its close integration with the college. It became more closely identified as Middle College High School. What transpired may be characterized as a reverse Hawthorne effect: the program was interpreted and executed by those who were not involved in the planning.

To provide a full day of instruction for each student, in the high school mode, tenth grade students were initially placed in college classes, although the plan called for this to happen at the eleventh grade. The outcome was not satisfactory and the placement was abandoned. Use of peers as tutors was not totally successful in the first year as the skills of the college students selected were not adequate to teach the high school student. Remediation was undertaken by a specially appointed English teacher who approached the task in a highly traditional way. Regular teachers efforts were irregular as their time was limited.

In spite of the obvious departure from the original plan, many students acted positively to the setting and some began to take the responsibility characteristic of a college student. Student responses[46] indicated a significant desire to attend college which appeared to be a result of the college environment. Both students and faculty commented positively on the closer relationships and the ability to meet students' needs as a result of the Middle College size. Counseling efforts appeared to be promoting interpersonal skills, particularly those of cooperation and decision making. By midpoint in the year, there were larger numbers of students who felt more comfortable with the self evaluation, grading and personal decision making.

The instructional mode most preferred was task oriented instruction. This method appealed to students not only because it provided an intellectual focus

---

[46] Millonzi, Joel, Middle College Research Report, Participant Observation Study, June 1975. LaGuardia Community College.

but also because it tended to keep one occupied in activity a state which many energetic adolescents felt comfortable. The remedial effort emphasized the need for faculty training and for a consistent effort at providing basic skill instruction in content area subject classes. Although career education exploratory classes were only a fraction of Middle College classes, their substance seemed to lend itself to the infusion of basic skill instruction. As the initial year progressed, the program settled in and some consistent structure evolved which provided security for both students and faculty. Some original goals appeared too ambitious as a result of the dichotomy between planning and innovation; other objectives assumed greater priority becuase of the faculty and student interaction.

The participant observation evaluation and resulting feedback, conducted by Dr. Joel Millonzi[47] analyzed the activity of Middle College and stimulated discussion and changes which corrected some of the first year's problems. Other difficulties: staff changes, reduced funding and a teacher's strike added complications. The continued existence of Middle College in its third year and the broader acceptance by the college staff reflected a stronger commitment by the LaGuardia administrators. The program is now acknowledged by the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education. Paradoxically the same factors which attenuated the innovative nature of the program also gave it strength and permanence. Once programmed into the high school structure, the Middle College appeared to be guaranteed continued financial support and some permanence. Its existence for three years, in the midst of budgetary crises, attests to the value of innovative institutions being incorporated into larger structures.

More college faculty taught Middle College courses: i.e., data processing, law and psychology. The close relationship between students and faculty continued and was communicated to incoming students. Career education was initiated for eleventh grade students. Teachers were more comfortable with the teacher counselor role and the "house concept" was designed to offer more structure for the student. The new student body of the second and third year classes reflects a higher academic level, suggesting that the guidance counselors at the recruiting schools are beginning

---

[47] Millonzi, J., op. cit.

to have a different perspective of the Middle College. Remediation efforts have been intensified with every tenth grader required to attend a lab twice a week for skill development. Tenth graders have a specific program time for counseling; eleventh and twelfth grade students are now counseling the younger students, after receiving training in peer counseling. The statistical results of the first and second years are discussed in the following pages. In its third year, the outcomes and degree of achievement of objectives will soon be apparent as the first group of students approach the college entry level.

OUTCOMES

Attrition

Table 1 shows that first year Middle College students show a fairly low attrition rate. In the first Middle College class this rate was 10.5 per cent, while the second class had a rate of 8.8 per cent. This was 12 per cent higher than anticipated. At the control schools, attrition rate was double that of Middle College.

Comparison Groups

Three separate groups of tenth year New York City public high school students, identified at the start of the 1974-75 academic year, participated in the study by supplying attendance and attrition data for the 1975-76 school year. Two of the groups — at John Jay and Canarsie High School — are comprised of youngsters in the specially-funded and -administered College Bound program. In each of these schools, roughly 100 students are identified as College Bound-eligible at the beginning of the tenth grade, and the groups thus formed receive special assistance and counseling for the remainder of their high-school career. Students in each of these schools receive somewhat different services by virtue of the fact that John Jay is a Title I-eligible school, and thus receives increased federal funding based on the disadvantaged economic and educational status of its entire student body, while Canarsie is a non-Title I school. The additional support granted Title I schools results in smaller classes, double periods in remedial classes, lower student-to-counselor ratios, and increased opportunities for cultural enrichment.

The third comparison group was comprised of students at Grover Cleveland High School. Three classes of low-reading-ability students were selected. These individuals had all been previously identified as "general track" (low-ability) students in a terminal program. While the vast majority of this group did receive special instruction in reading during the 1974-75 school year in addition to a regular English class, the group is not part of a College-Bound or any other special program.

These three groups, while not comprised of students directly comparable to those in the Middle College group, do provide a range of remedial treatment against which the Middle College program can be studied.[48]

In the second year of Middle College, this advantage disappeared; the attrition rate more closely resembles the control schools although it still remained significantly lower than the overall New York City rate.

Table 1

Registration, Attrition, and Attendance Data for the Middle College and Comparison Groups: 1974-75 School Year[a]

	Middle College	Canarsie	John Jay	Grover Cleveland
Register September 1974	141	116	102	
No shows & Sept. discharges	8	10	19	--
Net Starting Register	133	106	83	79
Fall 1974 discharges	4	3	1	6
Midyear discharges	4	8	4	--
Net Midyear Register	125	95	78	73
Midyear attrition as a percentage of net starting register	6.0%	10.4%	6.0%	7.6%
Spring 1975 discharges	2	--	1	3
Net End of Year Register	123	95	77	70
End of year attrition as a percentage of net starting register	7.5%	10.4%	7.2%	11.4%

[a] Only includes students on register from the beginning of the school year. There were 5 midyear admissions at Canarsie and 32 at John Jay.

[48] Ehrlich, D. J. and Kenneth Berger. The Middle College of LaGuardia Community College: An Evaluation of the First and Second Year of Operation.

Registration and Attrition Data for the Middle College and Comparison Groups:

1974-75 and 1975-76 School Years[a]

	Canarsie	John Jay	Grover Cleveland	Middle College 1st class	Middle College 2nd class
Register September 1974	116	102		141	
No shows & Sept. discharges	10	19	--	8	
Net starting register	106	83	79	133	
1974-75 discharges	11	20	10	14[b]	
End-of-year register	95	63	69	119	
Attrition percentage based on net starting register	10.4%	24.1%	12.7%	10.5%	
Register September 1975	95	63	69	119	113[c]
Fall 1975 discharges	7	11	3	11	3
Spring 1976	1	--	4	23	7
End-of-year register	87	52	62	85	103
Cumulative attrition percentage	17.9%	37.3%	21.5%	36.1%	8.8%

[a] Comparison groups are composed of only those students on register from the beginning of the 1974-75 school year. At Canarsie there were 5 admissions in 1974-75 and 4 in 1975-76. At John Jay there were 32 admissions in 1974-75 and 2 in 1975-76. Except for Canarsie, end-of-year registers for 1974-75 are at variance from those given in the previous report because of end-of-year transactions.

[b] Includes 2 students readmitted in 1975-76 and subsequently discharged in 1975-76.

[c] Includes 6 students admitted after September 9, 1975.

In regard to absences the Middle College students showed similar attendance patterns to other urban adolescents but evidenced a larger number of students who had an exceedingly high proportion of absences compared to the control schools.

Table 3

Middle College	25
Carnarsie	14
John Jay	13
Grover Cleveland	15

Table 4

	Middle College	Canarsie	John Jay	Grover Cleveland
Students with 30 or more absences for the school year	54	12	13	16
Percentage of end of year register with 30 or more absences	43.9%	12.6%	16.9%	25.4%[a]

[a] Excludes seven students for whom no attendance data were available.

Table 5

Shows the same data for two years of research

Attendance Data for the 1975-76 School Year: Middle College and Comparison Groups

	Canarsie (N=87)	John Jay (N=52)	Grover Cleveland (N=56)	Middle College 11th Year (N=85)	Middle College 10th Year (N=103)
Number of Absences					
0 - 9	26	12	13	5	6
10 - 19	28	20	14	9	7
20 - 29	11	14	14	19	21
30 - 39	8	4	6	21	8
40 - 59	10	1	4	11	20
60 or more	4	1	5	20	41
Number with 30 or more absences	22	6	15	52	69
Percent with 30 or more absences	25.3%	11.5%	26.8%	61.2%	67.0%
Percent with 30 or more absences in 1974-75	12.6%	16.9%	25.4%	43.9%	--

Despite poor attendance the achievement testing of the first year is remarkably complete. For the first class all but two of the starting register of 133 students completed the entire California Achievement Test battery prior to admission. In the second year, scores area available for approximately 75% of the entering class. Operationally, the loss results from the loss of personal in all educational settings and the consequent inability to follow up students and insure more complete data.

Table 6

Mean California Achievement Test Scores Obtained Upon Entry to the Middle College

	First Class[a]		Second Class[b]	
	Number	Grade Equivalent	Number	Grade Equivalent
Reading (total)	131	7.4	85	8.0
Vocabulary	131	7.4	85	8.3
Comprehension	131	7.3	85	7.8
Mathematics (total)	131	6.7	83	7.7
Computation	131	6.2	85	7.5
Concepts and Problems	131	7.1	83	8.0
Language (total)	131	6.1	82	7.5
Mechanics	131	5.9	82	7.5
Usage and Structure	131	6.7	85	7.7
Spelling	131	6.8	85	8.2
Battery Total	131	6.7	80	7.7

[a] Tests taken in May, 1974.

[b] Tests taken between September and December, 1975.

Table 7

Standardized Achievement Test Data of Middle College Students: Analysis of Differences Between Entrance Scores and Scores Obtained at the End of the 1975-76 School Year (Mean Grade Equivalent Scores)

	10th Year[a]			11th Year[b]		
	Number[c]	Pretest	Posttest	Number[d]	Pretest	Posttest
Reading (total)	60	7.8	8.7	72	7.2	8.4
Vocabulary	60	8.1	8.7	72	7.2	8.3
Comprehension	61	7.6	8.8	72	7.0	8.5
Mathematics (total)	58	8.1	8.8	71	6.8	8.3
Computation	59	8.1	8.8	71	6.4	8.1
Concepts and Problems	61	8.3	8.7	71	7.1	8.5
Language (total)	55	7.6	8.7	68	6.5	8.7
Mechanics	59	7.7	8.9	72	6.5	8.7
Usage and Structure	61	7.7	8.5	70	6.5	8.4
Spelling	61	8.2	9.0	70	7.3	8.3
Battery Total	52	7.9	8.7	68	6.8	8.4

[a] 8 months between pre- and posttests.

[b] 20 months between pre- and posttests.

[c] Includes scores of 66 different students.

[d] Includes scores of 74 different students.

ALTERNATIVE STRUCTURES

Existing Models

Analysis of the models visited organizes the approaches into four major groups: split day, courses on college campuses, courses on high school campuses and independent settings. The first three groups alter largely structural factors; site, faculty, curriculum level, and financial responsibility. To some degree, these alternatives represent a shuffling of the same components. The last group of innovation moves away from the preestablished format and is sufficiently different to warrant further consideration. Two of these are the Hudson County College Commission and the Staten Island Consortium.

The Consortium seeks to create continuity throughout the entire learning sequence, and the concept of a unified educational community is eminently suited to areas with a geographical entity and identity. In essence, the program has many of the merits of a well conceived decentralized approach. April 1, 1976 saw the incorporation of the Consortium as a non profit corporation with a Board of Directors, composed of administrators, union officials, and representatives of all branches of the system. The Consortium now exists outside the usual structure, giving it a different status and an expanded mission. Pragmatically, the direct accomplishments and the statistical achievements are exceedingly good. The results seem an outgrowth of an improved educational climate and the initiation of a dialogue between levels of education. Perhaps this is a most significant criteria for success, but it has the inherent danger of charisma; it may not last beyond the personal impact of the current leadership. The Staten Island model also has the college in a responsive, reactive role, acquiescing to the requests of the lower levels, developing criteria measures in reading and mathematics stimulating curriculum development and providing personnel for the elementary classroom.

There are three major programs at Staten Island which embody the principles of continuity and fluidity. First is a Bridge program, reminiscent of Marist and Post, which offers precollege students the opportunity to accrue college credits. An outgrowth of the original Bridge is a Gifted Bridge, available to select middle grade students. In the summer of 1976, talented eighth and ninth graders registered for advanced courses in computers, criminology and organic chemistry.

The Classroom Assistant Program (C.A. P.) enables college and high school students to assist the teacher. C.A.P. has placed 150 interns as tutors.

The goal of the Curriculum Articulation program is to review curricula and subject areas, eliminating overlaps and filling in gaps, so that a student can proceed through the curriculum from kindergarten to graduate school with a logical continuity.

A recent interesting development is the Learning Exchange in which people share skills and interests. Teachers need no credentials, just a willingness to share their ideas. Exchanges were initiated in 12 areas ranging from Art to Yoga.

Hudson County's brokerage model also offers great flexibility and potential for innovation in its design. The concept of the educational unit as a mediator and faciltator between the student and the institutions opens options in higher education and serves both parties well. The new institutional role embodied by the Hudson concept is an extremely difficult one; its success depends on softening the attitudes of cooperating institutions. Its economic value is stunning. Hudson has eliminated most of the inherent costs of administration, yet it is offering articulation. Dr. O'Neill has managed to have students carry their educational allocation beyond the secondary level by arranging a subcontracting approach to education. He considers the Commission to be acting like a foundation; it is financing other institutions and allowing them to realize capacities never utilized before. The structure of Hudson is different from any other setting. The major direct services provided are admission, counseling and remediation. The program eliminates the problems of staffing and space. Moreover the brokerage concept provides a flexibility which enables Hudson to undertake new ventures with ease and without restraint.

Hudson is now moving towards establishing a middle college. In this model, it will be a sub unit of a vocational-technical school with a special curriculum designed by college and high school staff. High school faculty will teach the program and students will receive dual credit.

New Departures

Up to now the models considered have incorporated changes largely within the existing framework. It is possible to develop alternatives which represent more basic changes in the educational environment.

An extensive change would occur if an institution shifted the criteria for grouping from age to achievement, thereby creating an interage non-graded class. Immediately, the student proceeds at his own pace, and the curriculum has some continuity. Another

outcome would be to dissolve the current distinction between secondary and higher education. An institution predicated on these principles would have a very different structure than the current 12th grade-freshman year approach. With the existing population diversity and the range of student competencies, an alternative grouping offers solutions to some current problems.

A major shift would be to change the current value system prevailing at the secondary level and to go the California way, allowing the student to leave the education system at tenth grade or at age 16. Removing the compulsory aspect of education may make the student available for voluntary, self-selected education. Building on that possibility, the system could offer a variety of plans for future education. One could be allowing the student to complete his high school diploma on the job, or in some field of service. Another would be to accredit summer experiences, courses by television or newspapers, making an external degree possible. This increases the options for students who have to work or who are homebound. At present the current drop out rate suggests that students don't attend school even if it is compulsory.

Perhaps, the freedom to choose may be a more conducive approach. There appears to be a need for a parallel structures, which grow alongside the existing secondary schools, but which have the quality of a community of learning. Simon's Rock has some of this flavor and the Lab school in Boston features another aspect of this approach. A model of this nature would be an alternative middle or intermediate college but it would also incorporate some features of the community college. There is also the possibility that a learning community might replace or expand some present continuing education units in higher education.

Learning Communities

The learning community would function on an all year round basis. It would feature an expanded concept of learning, including service, field courses, laboratory courses, mini courses and work-study. Students could utilize a split week, some days in service at hospitals, senior citizen units, or pre-schools, and some days in more structured classes. Subtly this approach encourages sectors of the society to work together. Immediately the unions and the employers become part of the educational structure. Some tentative efforts have been made in this direction by Parkway and City as School, but a broad application of the concept necessitates establishing an accreditation and administrative unit to coordinate extra classroom learning.

Modeled on the external degree, a learning community could reach down and form another bridge across the current gap.

Looking down the road, innovators can probably predict that parallel structures like learning communities will eventually be absorbed into the main stream. On the current educational scene, the only way to break down the existing regidities is to prove that alternative structures are both viable and in the long run economic. Living R and D seems the only way.

STRATEGIES FOR INVOLVING CLIENTELE

Publicity

Given the desirability of new structures how does an agency encourage individuals and institutions to participate? The first recommendation is an obvious one, drawn from that estimable American institution, advertising. Information on the schools and the concepts which underlie articulation need explication to the public. The effort is not to sell but to educate. Most of the innovators interviewed stressed the need for popularization of the product, for acquainting the public with the new vocabulary, for interpreting the gains to parents, faculty and students. Another need for publicity is to acquaint the students with options. At present most of their information is limited and selected by the high school guidance staff which tends to move the student in the regular channels because it's the easiest way. Students will seek other institutions if they are given the information.

The program should be professionally conceived and presented. Directors of settings have suggested regional or national T. V. programs of a documentary nature. A film could show the existing alternative structures and the ideas inherent in the concept.

Innovators can be encouraged by grants and by released time to do more research and to write more about the programs in popular periodicals. Articles can be prepared for Sunday supplements or teachers' union papers.

Events, conferences, award, can be provided which will then encourage reporters to do background features on the innovations. Some consultation with a public relations expert will yield a wealth of opportunities for promotion and dissemination of the ideas. Presently the effort is limited, naive, and individualistic.

A Coordinating Agency

As in all new structures, the particular units currently working with articulation have no organizational framework. Bastards or hybrids, the settings don't fit into anyone's guidelines. Some agency is necessary to coordinate the sporadic efforts at publicity, publications and recruitment. A joint organization, perhaps called The Council of Articulated Schools could coordinate funding efforts and have greater impact on the educational community.

A Clearing House: Networks

At the very least, some centralized clearing house should be established which would circulate material of interest and provide a newsletter. The Clearing House could also maintain a file of films and tapes which could be used for promotion, recruitment or informational purposes. The Clearing House could be established in connection with Nexus and an index of institutions exploring the articulation mode might be produced, resembling a specific Yellow Pages or an updated Valley.

The Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education might sponsor the "buddy system", where an institution embarking on a project in articulation would be assigned a buddy institution, which had been functioning in the area for at least three years. The service of consultation and cooperation could either be part of a required expenditure in a new grant application or could be an extension added on to the initial sponsorship with the senior institution accepting it as a responsbility.

A natural outgrowth of a published network would be identification of key people to act as catalysts in sponsoring innovations. Grants for leading workshops or for interdisciplinary presentation at major educational conferences could encourage institutions to engage in new ventures. An interdisciplinary package of an innovative program designer, a state or federal administrator, and a funding officer, would provide how-to-do-it information, and would be stimulating.

Secondly, members of the network could be funded to work individually with educators planning new units. Agencies like the Fund for Improvement of Post Secondary Education might include these consultation expenses as mandatory (similar to the trip to Washington) in the grant budget. In the long run, it would save many costly time, motion and money errors.

Thirdly, the identified consultants could act as a group of evaluators, similar to the National Institute of Health site visit or the Middle States accrediting agencies. The process here for the Fund might be two or three stages (1) a preliminary visit for evaluating funding proposals and (2) an on-demand, intermediate visit for consultation purposes and a final evaluation visit.

In regard to #3, the Fund might consider an expanded concept of evaluation differing from the success/failure, go it alone pattern. Some specific offer of help

would encourage administrators to undertake new educational adventures: it reassures the low risk takers. The idea would be to think of evaluation as a process, with feedback to the institution, and with the evaluators acting as consultants, as change agents, to move the innovation toward greater success.

There are many advantages to the concept described. (1) A knowledgeable group of interdisciplinary experts gains a broader, more pragmatic experience which improves their performance and eventually the process of educational evaluation. (2) The institution being evaluated profits from the breadth of the team's exposure; the project has a greater chance of success and the administrator is backed up or shares the responsibility and the risk. (3) A body of techniques can be assembled for evaluating innovative institutions. (4) More objectivity can be brought to a process as a result of 1 and 2 which then feeds back to criteria for judging future proposals, completing the loop. (5) The adversary relationship and the consequent "best foot forward" syndrome of the institution may be mitigated by the helpful, cooperating relationship and function of the evaluator, which may encourage the institution to expand its innovation.

Administrative Training

Activities designed to create awareness of the concept are necessary to attract supervisor/administrators. Part of this responsibility may rest with the teacher training institution, but a special training institute for administrators to learn the skills necessary for directing innovative projects may be desirable. A follow up of these institutes could be internships and in services programs which open up a new area of educational-administrative practice. Here the goal is to bring theory and practice together, to lead and support faculty, and to monitor change.

Faculty Incentives

Another important area is the development of faculty incentives, particularly a sense of faculty identity beyond the individual institution. The suggested coordinating institution could also sponsor faculty exchanges or interchanges where faculty could move from one level to another or from one institution to another. These exchanges should occur after two or three years at one institution not at the proverbial seventh year.

Additionally, funds could be appropriated for faculty to spend time in curriculum planning. At present there are few allocations for this purpose once an institution is established. Yet, the opportunity to revise and replan is a key factor in maintaining innovation. It is also a well accepted truism that there is a significant relationship between the relationships of the school power structure and professional role behavior. The more the faculty member feels personally influential, the more innovation will result.

Therefore, funding guidelines should specify participation of faculty as well as administrative personnel. Observation of that guideline will also result in more participation in innovation as more faculty see their colleagues as influential.

A possible result of this opportunity would be a study to examine the curriculum from the junior high school on through the college years. Two questions should be posed: Are the schools doing what they say they are doing? What should be done at what level? The step following would be evaluating the requirements for a high school diploma.

Federal Incentives

Questions as universal as the ones stated may well fall under the domain of federally funded projects. The federal government can create economic incentives for accelerated programs. Post secondary schools can be encouraged to admit students at the end of the tenth year by providing a financial bonus for every accelerated student. Schools could receive a bonus for a lowered student to counselor ratio, encouraging the schools to hire more counselors. A special category of educational experiments to include expanded use of technology could qualify for special grants.

Fiscal

1. Investigate the flow of money, the way in which the institution is reimbursed for student.
   (a) If the institution is private, determine a fee schedule.
   (b) If the institution is public, examine the per pupil allocation and the conduit for the money, i.e. state or city or community funding.
2. Examine the existing or comparative costs for education at that level.
3. Estimate the costs of the new institution.
   (a) Planning costs.
   (b) Operating budget.
4. Estimate the income.
   (a) State and local funding.
   (b) Tuition payments.
5. Study the basis for determining basis of reimbursement for pupil to faculty to teacher ratio.
6. Make a three year budget projection.

   Enumerate salary costs; use union scale information

   - Director
   - Faculty
   - Counselors
   - Fringe Benefits
   - Secretarial Staff
   - Fringe for Staff
   - Other than Personal Services
     - Instructional supplies
     - General supplies
     - Postage
     - Office services
     - Telephone
   - Space related costs
   - Capital Equipment

   Enumerate income: Sources and Calendar of Payments.

Community

1. Establish inter school relations.
2. Inform receiving and cooperating schools of plans.
3. Present draft for suggestions.
4. Schedule conferences with new supervisory personnel, principals, supervisors, superintendents. Meet with key influential community groups, religious leaders, parents, clubs, civic improvement societies.
5. Develop a strategy for dealing with union representatives.
6. Reassure cooperating and collegial institutions, avoid threatening postures.
7. Maintain a low profile until all permissions are obtained.
8. Confer with chancellors and supervisors once all grass roots acceptance is achieved.
9. Communicate recruitment criteria to parents, community, guidance personnel.
10. Develop recruitment materials, film strip, brochure, forms.
11. Devise schedule for recruitment.
12. Develop screening instrument and procedure, train recruiters and screeners, order testing equipment.
13. Communicate to support staff: security, nurses, admissions, etc.

Union

1. Investigate whether the staff and faculty will come under the existing union contract or whether the middle college staff will be covered by another contractual agreement.
2. Study the agreement and translate its parameters into the budget, the legal steps, and the staffing plans.
3. Check the size of classes, the salary scale, and separation of functions.
4. Investigate the possibility of new job titles and descriptions, i.e. teacher/counsellor.
5. Find out the extent of the working day, week, number of hours permitted, number of classes scheduled. Relate to projected programming of students.
6. Clarify policies in regard to hiring, firing, transfer and tenure, supervision and evaluation.
7. Examine whether teachers are to be paid for planning time.
8. Establish daily rate so as to estimate planning costs.
9. If faculty are to be drawn from two union contracts, i.e. college and secondary school, develop an exchange ratio. For instance how can you compensate the faculty member who is paid on a fifteen hour week in comparison to a teacher who is paid on a 30 hour week?
10. Develop a plan for faculty interchange.
11. Plan joint announcements for publicity.

Planning Staff

1. Establish criteria for director.
2. Provide a job description and a salary scale.
3. Initiate and carry out search for director.
4. Construct the relationship of the director to the sponsoring institution. To whom will he report? What is the position of the new unit in relation to other units in the system? In what areas will there be autonomy?
5. Establish the structure for interchange with the college.
6. Decide the kinds of staff who will be recruited to plan the curriculum and order the materials.
7. If the program is to have a work study or cooperative education component, initial contacts have to be made for potential jobs.
8. Hire a job coordinator to develop list of job opportunities.
9. Prepare a position paper to include educational objectives, strategies, philosophy, and program.
10. Circulate paper for comment to leading educators. Collate suggestions and revise.

Personnel

1. Appoint a director.
2. Begin to list faculty positions with qualifications, criteria, and salary.
3. Recruit faculty, interview and hire staff.
4. Select some staff members to do planning.
5. Study other institutions.
6. Visit similar models.
7. Introduce staff to colleagues at social function.

Curriculum

1. Study requirements for grade, certification, transfer and diploma granting.
2. Decide on courses to be offered.
3. Describe specific goals for achievement levels in curriculum areas. State in terms of competencies.
4. Outline targeted student body with expected range of achievement and provide remediation program in basic skills, if needed.
5. Plan method of grouping, for governance, for instruction.
6. Select screening and recruitment procedure and plan timetable for recruitment activities. See that this fits in with regular calendar utilized by other institutions.
7. Design forms for admission, record keeping and evaluation.

8. Determine general scheduling principles and credits.
9. Decide on grading system and criteria to be used.
10. Develop counseling allocations.

Governance

1. Establish relationships between cooperating institutions.
2. Enact governance procedures to incorporate new structure.
3. Clarify lines of authority and responsibility.
4. Explore student governance patterns to be offered to students.

Facilities

1. Project space needs for three years. Include classrooms, offices, labs, lounges, cafeterias.
2. Itemize capital equipment needed and schedule for ordering and delivery.
3. Authorize building or reconstruction plans, if necessary.

Evaluation

1. Consult other institutions and evaluators.
2. Determine criteria for evaluation.
3. Decide on method of evaluation.
4. Select evaluation team.
5. Decide on criteria for instructional evaluation.
6. Have team write objectives and methods of evaluation.
7. Schedule evaluation timetable.
8. Circulate and gain approval for evaluation plan.
9. Provide funding for evaluation.
10. Provide record keeping system for attendance, attrition, grades, pre and post testing.

Administrative

1. Prepare the institution for the initiation of the project.
2. Develop faculty support.
3. Select key faculty to be involved.
4. Lock the involvement into the college's reward system.
5. Integrate the articulated unit into the student government.
6. Clarify the role of the director and faculty vis a vis the supporting institution.
7. Set aside time for faculty training.

EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Areas:

Institutional	Community	Evaluation
Staffing	Recruitment	Dissemination
Curricula	Counseling	
Students	Portability	
Credits		

I. Institutional

What are the characteristics of the sponsoring institution?

What is the commitment of the institution to the project?

How is that commitment demonstrated?

- Level of staff involved
- Institutional involvement demonstrated
- Approval of faculty
- Released time of administrators and planning staff

Has the institution studied other plans similar to the projected one?

A. Planning Document

Is the planning document specific?

Does the planning document state educational philosophies and values?

Are the program goals explicitly stated?

Does the planning document enumerate the program materials?

What is the projected size of the school?

- Is that size consistent with stated goals?
- Is the size realizable?

How is funding to be accomplished?

Are the lines of authority clear?

B. Motives

What are the motives for establishing the innovative setting?

Is the institution willing to re-examine the traditional methods in education?

B. Motives (continued)

Does the institution encourage innovation?

Are there opportunities for faculty to be supported in their endeavor?

C. Governance

What is the governance mechanism?

Does the institution have autonomy?

In what areas?

To whom is it responsible?

Where is the authority lodged? Is it a clear line of authority?

D. Planning

Has the state education law been researched?

Is there a specific timetable?

How much time is allocated to planning before accepting students?

How much time is allotted to staff selection?

How much time is allotted to staff training?

How much time is planned for developing community receptivity?

At what point will the union, the state legislature, etc. be contacted?

Will there be staff and student orientation?

What is to be included in these programs?

What is the program for community education?

How will the cooperating schools be informed of the program?

Can the program be transferred to another institution?

II. Community

Is the community involved? How?

What have the contacts been with union, other school administrators, legislators?

What channels have been established to reach parents, guidance counsellors, other administrators?

Is there a brochure, a film, a presentation?

Can the media be used to promote the setting?

Who has the responsibility for community liaison?

How does that person function in the school governance?

Will there be opportunities for parents and students and other school personnel to ask questions? What will the forum be?

III. Personnel and Staffing

What is the criteria for selection of project director?

What is the criteria for selection of faculty?

How will these criteria be judged?

Is the institution using marginal people to teach? Graduate assistants?

Are faculty recruited from high school or college or both?

Is there provision for faculty training, orientation and inservice training?

What is the supervisory process and whose responsibility is it?

Is there a contractual arrangement for evaluation, promotion, retention?

Are there opportunities for faculty to exchange information with other settings?

Are faculty released for curriculum planning?

Are minority people on staff as role models?

What is the student faculty ratio?

What is the ratio of faculty to student support services and administration?

IV. Counseling

What are the criteria for hiring counsellors?

What are their roles and responsibilities?

What is the ratio to students, to faculty?

What is the relationship of counselor to faculty?

Who is the supervisor?

What is the structure for counseling?

Is there time in the academic schedule for faculty/counsellor conferences?

Do counsellors do academic, vocational and personal counseling?

Who evaluates the student?

How is that evaluation communicated?

V. Students

What student group is targeted?

How are students selected?

What is the screening process?

What is the information sought and needed?

V. Students (continued)

Where are students recruited?

Are visits made to sending school?

Is communication established with sending counselor?

How does the student qualify?

Who is responsible for transcripts, records?

What is the students' motivation in coming to the institution?

What is the process of providing information for parents?

Where is that information available?

Is there a recruitment pamphlet?

Where is the student's primary source of identity? (class, school, college)

How is the students' program planned?

Are there opportunities for group projects, club activity?

Is there a home room?

Can the student proceed at his own pace?

How many electives are available?

Are transportation passes available?

Is there a cafeteria? Is lunch free?

What is the student government?

VI. Facilities

Are facilities adequate?

Is there a gym?

Do faculty have individual offices?

Do offices have facilities to be locked?

Are there lockers?

Is there a reading lab? a math lab?

How many students does the average classroom accomodate?

Is there a lounge?

Are students allowed to smoke?

Is there a library? Or a special section in a library?

Do students share facilities with other populations?

Where do students hang out?

Is there a faculty lounge? a faculty cafeteria?

VII. Curriculum

Has the curriculum been jointly developed by high school and college?

Has the program been checked against requirements?

Are there provisions for interdisciplinary study?

Are there electives?

Does it feature individualized instruction?

Is there opportunity for independent study?

Is remediation available where indicated?

How is the educational technology utilized in the program?

Does the program allow for self pacing?

VIII. Portability

Is the program transportable to other localities, settings?

Is it suited for public or private sectors or both?

Is it self supporting?

What individual legislative requirements must be met before implementing the program?

How long a period of planning is necessary before instituting the program?

IX. Transfer

How is the students transcript organized?

How does he transfer his credit to another institution?

Will he receive a diploma or certificate?

Has contact been made with receiving institutions?

Who has responsibility for transfer of records and credit?

What is the procedure for informing him of transfer options?

X. Evaluation

What are the objectives of the evaluation?

What kind of data are being collected?

Is the data being fed back periodically to faculty?

Who is responsible for the collection and analysis of data?

What are qualifications of the evaluator?

X. Evaluation (continued)

Is that a clear, reimbursed position?

Is the faculty involved in testing, data collection?

Does the institution have a research division?

Is there adequate funding for evaluation?

What are the arrangements for reporting findings?

Is the schedule reasonable?

Will the preliminary findings be fed back to administrators?

Is there a provision for measuring:

attendance

attrition

achievement

student satisfaction

motivation

faculty satisfaction

What are the academic evaluation procedures?

Is the student involved in these procedures?

XI. Dissemination

What is the intended audience for communicating outcomes?

How will the information be disseminated?

Who is responsible for providing it?

What is the mechanism for reporting to the governance authorities?

Are there funds for dissemination?

Who has the responsibility for dissemination?

Has time been allocated for writing?

What channels are projected for dissemination?

What media will be utilized?

What is the relationship of the evaluation team to the people responsible for dissemination?

For the first Middle College class, the 2.2 (grade equivalent years) gain in language total over the two year period exceeds the expected gain for this population by a full year. The gains in Mathematics are approximately one half year above the expected outcomes. The progress in reading is equivalent to the expected rate of progress.

The second year class of Middle College shows that the rate of reading and mathematics scores were slightly in excess of anticipated post test scores. The mean language total score was one half of a grade equivalent greater than the anticipated test scores.

If the rate of progress is continued, extrapolation of the achievement scores suggest at the time of graduation, students of the first middle college class will have mean reading total and mathematics total scores of about grade nine, while the scores for the second class will be at about tenth grade. Currently, this compares favorably with the entering class at LaGuardia.

SUGGESTED POLICY CHANGES

The Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education has established an excellent record of achievement in its short history. The activity generated by the Fund has sponsored and supported educational innovation on a national scale and has provided strength and inspiration to innovative educators. To continue the excellence of its functioning, certain policy changes may be indicated as the Fund moves ahead to support articulated settings. Obviously all of these changes can not be adopted; some are mutually exclusive with a limited budget. Alternatives are offered for policy decisions; the directions suggested may provide a basis for requesting additional support. The suggestions for change emphasize five major areas:

(1) Extending the time frame of grants.

(2) Supporting a broader, more inclusive group of grantees.

(3) Playing a larger advisory role in legislative action.

(4) Increasing the scope of activity funded.

(5) Broadening the evaluation concept.

Time

The Fund may consider selecting certain key projects of articulation which represent seminal ideas and offering those innovators multi-year funding. Although, the Fund now does support some projects for a period of three years, the suggestion is to be more active in choosing which projects and themes deserve that consideration in the light of the focus of the Fund. In other words, FIPSE determines the commitment so that it may give certain projects more visibility and endurance. Extended support can provide certain advantages in understanding the progress of an innovation and its evolution over the initial period. Longitudinal study emphasizes the factors responsible for success or failure which are often not obvious in the first experimental year. The sequential years also point out the problems of maintaining innovation or the pitfalls of introducing too much innovation too quickly. Sometimes the planner is propelled to offer something new each year to gain funding. Often that is detrimental to the original innovation. In selecting key projects, the Fund can then have models of significant change which can be used as demonstrations for future projects, as living, learning research.

From the other point of view, extended funding enhances success. The project achieves some stability and the planners can spend more time directly on the implementation rather than on continued fund raising. That limited security enables planning and encourages staff and pupil recruitment in a time when insecurity may be encouraging conservatism. It can legitimatize a project. Guaranteeing the funding, if possible, for an extended period helps the project overcome the first year's experimental period which appears to be a key time for learning in new institutions. (The problems evidenced in Middle College paralleled those experienced by LaGuardia Community College.)

The policy decision to be made by the Fund must consider the impact of a larger investment in a selected number of projects versus start up money for greater variety of minor innovations. It seems clear from the study undertaken (particularly Hiscip and the Lab School) that an initial year is not sufficient to establish an articulated structure which has any broad impact. Most changes require at least two years in planning and an operational year to reveal strengths and weaknesses. Expert consultation by the network suggested may cut down this time, but creation of a few models which has longevity may provide important information and a different potential for the Fund.

Broaden the Group

In another direction, the Fund may wish to expand its support to a larger group of individuals and institutions, particularly those outside the educational structure. As the established institutions disintegrate and legislated settings decline in their flexibility to meet the needs of the changing students, new and parallel structures appear. Currently, TV stations, commercial enterprises, large corporations and groups of individuals are finding new ways to meet the need for articulation. Often the educators engaged in these projects are creative and seek new approaches beyond the institutional setting; consequently they do not have the required traditional base to conform to most guidelines. In some cases the setting is profit making; in others the bureaucracy discourages the innovator. In many cases those factors are not the decisive ones in determining whether an

innovation is worthy of support but they serve as impediments. The concept of brokerages and linkages has considerable merit but it is often disqualified because an individual facilitating the relationships has no traditional academic position and functions outside the usual channels; yet some of these innovations are worthy of support. In a period of restricted municipal and state funding and increased caution by private foundations, new ideas are often discouraged; therefore the need to look outside the establishment and tap the underground for projects and people becomes more important as the projects generated by the institutionalized settings diminish. Adoption of this policy requires careful monitoring and built in evaluation, as well as a consulting service.

A Larger Advisory Role

The philosophy of expanding the Fund's role brings an added responsibility which comes with aging: undertaking a stronger advisory role towards institutions and individuals who contribute new ideas. The Fund has now accumulated an extensive background on articulated programs; its officers are knowledgeable and experienced; yet it may not be using its full potential to help the grantee to avoid pitfalls and to maximize success. In some way, perhaps through the suggested network of consultants or through expanded staff, the Fund can play an important role in enhancing projects if the knowledge accumulated over the past years was compiled and made available to planners. (This project is a mini example of that type of effort in a limited area.)

If advising and consulting was to be added to the Fund's activities, it would serve as a living example of the value of the field of participant observation and of the process of feedback evaluation. In that way, the Fund becomes its own demonstration model for innovation.

None of these suggestions should be construed as adding responsibilities to the existing staff. New members or adjunct advisors are necessary to accomplish added responsibilities and expansion necessitates a larger budget.

Some of these added efforts could be administered by adjunct consultants or part time advisors. Perhaps the establishment of a working pool of consultants might be added to the administrative structure.

Part of the larger advisory role could include a task force available to legislators, both state and federal. Frequently, change in articulation requires new legislation; often the legislators have no background to determine the ramifications of a suggested change. The Fund does not have to play an advocacy role, merely an informative one which would offer the legislators better decision making information. In many ways, such a role would create an entirely different climate for innovation on a nation wide scale and give educators encouragement to remove some of the artificial and anachronistic barriers which now hamper change.

Increasing the Scope

An alternative to accomplish the suggested policy changes is to increase the scope of the Fund, to generate needed research. This may involve inter-agency cooperation but would target areas where research questions need investigation. An example would be a national curriculum which would identify the flow and sequence of skills and competencies to be taught and would break down the separation of educational administration. The whole area of determining the sequence of skills necessary for different credentialization is in flux and some assessment needs to be made in the area of both secondary and post secondary education.

Another issue which cries for assessment is the question of what should the schools teach at what level? Changes in society have placed an increasing burden on the schools which they are incapable of meeting. The question arises concerning the appropriate requirements for high school diplomas and other accreditation.

The other area for increased scope is dissemination of new ideas through publicity and promotion. These activities will be discussed under the heading of dissemination, but the purpose is to improve the climate for acceptance of innovation and to encourage further innovation.

Improving Evaluation

The suggestions of improving evaluation procedures need not be an alternative; it can be combined with some of the other policy recommendations. In this area, the Fund can harvest and make available its cumulative experience by offering a handbook which can alert and guide project directors to the need for evaluation planning and to the personnel available to do a creditable job. Too frequently projects are evaluated according to the old boy network process or the contract represents a political plum to some contractual agency. New techniques are available for innovative settings, yet most of the plans rely heavily on qualitative data which may not answer the questions of how and why did the program succeed or fail. The Fund can play a leadership role and a useful function in validating research techniques by encouraging new techniques: i.e. participant observer evaluation and by educating its project directors in contemporary methods of evaluation. Serious questions about short and long term evaluation have not been adequately discussed. When should evaluation occur? How often? If the goal of evaluation is to measure the program in terms of its own objectives other questions arise. How do you measure the impact of an articulated school setting? What are the factors to be analyzed in student self-realization is the goal? Is a school the appropriate institution to accomplish that goal? How do you evaluate learning communities or group homes? Questions and data dealing with institutional learning or the ripple effect need exploration. How many settings copied or adapted an innovative program? We may be ready for a genealogy to trace the routes and the generations of projects with legitimate and illegitimate offspring. We also need careful investigation of failures. Information about projects which did not succeed can be as useful as those which did as a learning technique, for future guidelines.

Encouraging a new concept of evaluation, where the consultants analyze and then remain on campus to suggest ways of improvement would be a boon to innovators. Making the consultative process a mutual undertaking promotes honesty and substitutes a cooperative relationship for an adversary one. Although this may be a more expensive method of evaluation in the short run, it may prove to be more economical in the long run.

DISSEMINATION STRATEGIES

Although many dissemination strategies have already been suggested in other parts of the report, it may be useful to review the previous recommendations made.

1. Identify key and model projects of articulation, support them and promote their programs.

2. Utilize the media and the appropriate educational channel to create awareness of the opportunities available for students and to educate the public about some of the new developments in articulated settings.

(a) Sponsor a television documentary to discuss the issues, using existing institutional examples.

(b) Provide newspaper background stories about settings.

(c) Develop a national index of articulated programs; a coordinated catalogue for students and counselors and planners engaged in innovation. Also a resource booklet with the names of educators.

(d) Promote educational conferences around the theme of articulation for secondary and post secondary teachers, administrators, guidance counselors, admissions officers.

(e) Develop a teacher training institute or program to train administrators and faculty.

(f) Coordinate a newtowk of educators available to act as consultants and lecturers. Share the information with Nexus and the Higher Education Agencies.

3. Underwrite support for educators to write books, pamphlets and articles about articulation. Act as a facilitator for individual authors to publish these articles (i.e. Suggest that the focus of an issue of an educational journal be articulation. Provide the journal with potential contributors.)

4. Publish a newsletter, similar to the National Endowment for the Humanities, which describes some of the Fund's projects. Circulate it to both secondary and post secondary institutions.

5. Initiate a brochure which will go directly to students or engage in some direct communication to student groups to acquaint them with the educational alternatives. The development of a student profile, identifying the kind of student who could profit from articulated settings would be effective in this context.

6. All of these activities could be subsumed under a national project geared to dissemination, which would include all of the above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bettelheim, Bruno, Daedalus.

Blackmer, Alan R., et. al. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1952.

Blos, Peter. On Adolescence: A Psychoanalytic Interpretation. The Free Press, 1966.

Blanchard, B. Edward, A National Survey of Curriculum Articulation Between the College of Liberal Arts and the Secondary School, Chicago, 1971.

Bruce, Firth, Grimsley and Halverian, Educational Forum, January and March 1976.

Carnegie Quarterly, Vol. 44, No. 1, Winter, 1976, Carnegie Corporation.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Continuity and Discontinuity, 1973.

Chapman, David and Wilbur, Franklin; Project Advance, N.Y. State Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol II, Number 1, 1976.

Coleman, James S. Yanter, Transition to Adulthood, Washington, D.C., 1974.

David, Robert B. The Reformed Mathematics Curriculum, High School, 1980, Pitman Publishing Co. 1970.

Ehrlich, D.J. and Kenneth Berger, The Middle College of LaGuardia Community College, An Evaluation of First and Second Year of Operation.

Elkind, David, N.Y. Times Magazine, May 26, 1968.

Erikson, Erik H., Childhood and Society, W.W. Norton, 1963.

Hall, Elizabeth, The House of Education Needs Overhaul, 1966

Hanson, Harlan P. The Four School Study - College Entrance Examination Board, N.Y. 1970.

Keniston, Kenneth, The Uncommitted; Alienated Youth in American Society, N.Y., Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Meinert, Charles, Making a Mesh of Things: School College Articulation, N.Y. State Education Department.

Millonzi, Joel, Middle College Research Report, pg. 38.

Osborn, W.J., Overlapping and Omission in our Courses of Study. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company, 1928.

Passow, Harry. Once Again: Reforming Secondary Education. Teachers College Record, Vol. 77, Number 2, Dec. 1975.

Singer, David A., Secondary School Higher Education Articulation, Community and Junior College Journal, Feb. 1974.

Snyder, Norman, Linking Schools and Colleges, N.Y. State Ed. Department, 1975.

Whitlock, Baird, Somon's Rock, Community and Junior College Journal, Feb. 1974, Vol. 44, No. 5.

Wilbur, Franklin, School College Articulation Report #5 - Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University, 1975.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
JUN 20 1977
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES